

THE
BIBLE
FOR HOME
& SCHOOL

ST. MARK

Harry L. Smith.

G.M. Elliott Library
Cincinnati Bible College & Seminary
2700 Glenway Avenue
P.O. Box 04320
Cincinnati, Ohio 45204-3200

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK

THE BIBLE FOR HOME AND SCHOOL

SHAILER MATHEWS, GENERAL EDITOR

GENESIS

By PROFESSOR H. G. MITCHELL

DEUTERONOMY

By PROFESSOR W. G. JORDAN

JUDGES

By PROFESSOR EDWARD L. CURTIS

JOB

By PROFESSOR GEORGE A. BARTON

ISAIAH

By PROFESSOR JOHN E. MCFADYEN

AMOS, HOSEA, AND MICAH

By PROFESSOR J. M. POWIS SMITH

MATTHEW

By PROFESSOR A. T. ROBERTSON

MARK

By PROFESSOR M. W. JACOBUS

ACTS

By PROFESSOR GEORGE H. GILBERT

GALATIANS

By PROFESSOR B. W. BACON

EPHESIANS AND COLOSSIANS

By REVEREND GROSS ALEXANDER

HEBREWS

By PROFESSOR E. J. GOODSPEED

VOLUMES IN PREPARATION

I SAMUEL

By PROFESSOR L. W. BATTEN

PSALMS

By REVEREND J. P. PETERS

JOHN

By PROFESSOR SHAILER MATHEWS

ROMANS

By PROFESSOR E. I. BOSWORTH

I AND II CORINTHIANS

By PROFESSOR J. S. RIGGS

THE BIBLE FOR HOME AND SCHOOL

A COMMENTARY
ON
THE GOSPEL ACCORDING
TO MARK

BY
MELANCTHON W. JACOBUS, D.D.
DEAN OF THE FACULTY AND HOSMER PROFESSOR OF NEW
TESTAMENT EXEGESIS, HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY

G.M. ELLIOTT LIBRARY
Cincinnati Bible College & Seminary

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1915

All rights reserved

226.307

J15c

COPYRIGHT, 1915

By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Set up and electrotyped. Published September, 1915.

The references in the foot-notes marked "SV" are to the American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible. Copyright, 1901, by Thomas Nelson & Sons.

By PERMISSION OF THE PUBLISHERS.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

THE BIBLE FOR HOME AND SCHOOL is intended to place the results of the best modern biblical scholarship at the disposal of the general reader. It does not seek to duplicate other commentaries to which the student must turn. Its chief characteristics are (*a*) its rigid exclusion of all *processes*, both critical and exegetical, from its notes; (*b*) its presupposition and its use of the assured results of historical investigation and criticism wherever such results throw light on the biblical text; (*c*) its running analysis both in text and comment; (*d*) its brief explanatory notes adapted to the rapid reader; (*e*) its thorough but brief Introductions; (*f*) its use of the Revised Version of 1881, supplemented with all important renderings in other versions.

Biblical science has progressed rapidly during the past few years, but the reader still lacks a brief, comprehensive commentary that shall extend to him in usable form material now at the disposition of the student. It is hoped that in this series the needs of intelligent Sunday School teachers have been met, as well as those of clergymen and lay readers, and that in scope, purpose, and loyalty to the Scriptures as a foundation of Christian thought and life, its volumes will stimulate the intelligent use of the Bible in the home and the school.

SHAILER MATHEWS.

NOTE

The Author desires to acknowledge the assistance given him by his colleague, Professor William H. Worrell, in the reading of the proof and the compilation of the Indices—the latter being entirely of his own hand.

M. W. J.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	I
I. The Gospel Itself	I
II. The Tradition Regarding the Gospel	6
III. The Sources of the Gospel	12
IV. The Relation of Mark to Matthew and Luke	16
V. The Date of Mark	23
VI. The Historical Value of Mark	24
VII. The Text	26
VIII. Analysis	29
IX. Bibliography	34
COMMENTARY	37
INDEX	249

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK

INTRODUCTION

FOR the interpreter of any narrative writing it is of fundamental importance that he should know the historical value of the narrative which it contains.

The first question, therefore, which presents itself in an introduction to the interpretation of the Gospels is as to their origin. If they come to us from the Apostolic times and embody the testimony of those who participated in the events which they record, there is a historical value to their narrative which is lacking if their origin is in a later age and their testimony that of those who knew the facts simply from long developed tradition. It is only natural that we should inquire as to the writers of the Gospels and their sources of information, and it is quite as natural that, for an answer to our query, we should go first to the Gospels themselves. Did the earliest testimony we have regarding them profess to be contemporaneous with their origin, the question of their historical value would be a simple matter. As, however, they lie confessedly behind the testimony which is given to them, they present a problem in themselves which invites our first attention.

I. THE GOSPEL ITSELF

1. In coming to the Gospel of Mark, we find that in common with all the narrative writings, but unlike almost all the Epistles of the New Testament, it does not contain the name of its author.

While it may be difficult to avoid the conviction that in the incident of 14 : 51f. the Author gives his own experience, referring to himself as "a certain young man" in a similarly indefinite way to the Fourth Evangel-

INTRODUCTION

ist's generally accepted reference to himself in his Gospel (Jn. 18 : 15f.; 20 : 1-10); yet there is no means of identifying the "young man" there mentioned—not even to the extent of proving that he was one of the personal disciples of Jesus.¹

From a general study of the Gospel, however, it is clear that, while it lacks the Jewish cast of narrative evident in the First Gospel, yet the familiarity which the Author shows with Jewish geography (cf. 1 : 38 [see notes]; 4 : 35 with 5 : 1; 4 : 45 [see notes]; 7 : 31; 8 : 22, 27 [see notes]; 10 : 1 [see notes]) and with Jewish customs (cf. 2 : 18-20; 5 : 38; 7 : 2-4; 11 : 15; 14 : 1; 15 : 6) and beliefs (cf. 12 : 18), and the ability which he seems to have in explaining them (cf. 7 : 2ff.; 14 : 12; 15 : 42)—particularly his acquaintance with the Aramaic language, which he is constantly translating for his readers' use (cf. 3 : 17; 5 : 41; 7 : 11, 34; 10 : 46; 14 : 36; 15 : 22, 34)—mark him as a Jewish Christian.

2. It cannot be claimed that these facts prove, on the other hand, that the readers of the Gospel were Gentile Christians; for the Jewish Christian readers of the First Gospel were equally unacquainted with these Palestinian details. Yet they add to the significant presence in the Gospel of certain Latin terms (*e.g.* the original for "bed," 2 : 4; 6 : 55; "pots," 7 : 4; "centurion," 15 : 39, 44f.; the phrase "began as they went," 2 : 23; "soldier of the guard," 6 : 27; "wishing to content," 15 : 15) and to the evident desire of the Author at times to use these terms for the sake of being understood by his readers (cf. 12 : 42, "which make a farthing"; 15 : 16, "which is the *Prætorium*").² When in addition it is considered that, apart from references made by Jesus himself and by others,

¹ For full discussion of this point, see Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. ii, pp. 491-494.

² Note the absence of all such explanations when reference is made to Pilate and his official position (15 : 1) and to political events during his term of office (15 : 7).

INTRODUCTION

there is almost a total absence of Old Testament quotations as an argumentative background for the narrative, or of any reference to the Law as such, it would seem that the Gentile character of the readers was a natural inference.

3. There is nothing in the Gospel which definitely locates the readers. Acquaintance with Latin throughout the Roman Empire was too wide to make the Author's employment of words and phrases from this language conclusive evidence that the readers resided in Rome; though the fact that, as compared with the other Gospels, the Latin atmosphere of the Markan writing is distinctive would agree with such a residence, could it otherwise be proved, and would in general indicate that the readers belonged to the Western rather than the Eastern part of the Early Church. Were we assured as to the identity of the Rufus mentioned by Paul in his letter to the Roman Church (16 : 13) with the Rufus mentioned in the Gospel (15 : 21) as one of the children of Simon of Cyrene, we might infer that the author's inclusion of these children in his recital of the incident was due to the fact that his readers lived in Rome and would be naturally interested in this detail. Possibly the emphasis which he places on things clean and unclean (7 : 1-23) might be considered as due to the discussion of this distinction which we learn from the Epistle to the Romans (ch. 14) was prevalent in that community. These points in themselves, however, are, neither singly nor together, conclusive as to the residence of the readers.

4. To these readers, born and bred as they had been in the great world of Gentile action, it was the author's purpose to present Jesus in the actual reality of his wonderful life. He was not concerned with proving him to be the fulfilment of Messianic prophecy, as was the First Evangelist, nor with presenting him as the realization of the world's need of a Saviour, as was the Third Evangelist, or with portraying him as the objective of the soul's spiritual communion, as was the Fourth Evangelist; his aim was

simply to show him to others as he had showed himself to his disciples in all the human and superhuman facts of his life. One cannot but be impressed with the objectivity of the narrative; but it does not present itself as the product of a literary realism, but of a vivid recollection. It seems as though it was written with the conviction, not that something new had been discovered, but that something new had happened in the history of the world.¹ It brings into light, beyond the other Gospels, the real humanity of Jesus (*e.g.* his compassion, 1 : 41; his anger, 3 : 5; 10 : 14; his love, 10 : 21; his subjection to bodily fatigue, 4 : 38; his liability to surprise, 6 : 6; his suffering of hunger, 11 : 12; his lack of knowledge, 13 : 32), and at the same time his consciousness of supreme authority over and of holding in himself the destiny of the religious life of man (*e.g.* 2 : 10, 28; 10 : 45; 14 : 62). It contains few of the discourses of Jesus; the narrative is devoted rather to making prominent, not only the remarkable deeds of his life, but the startling impressions which they produced on those who witnessed them (*e.g.* 1 : 27; 2 : 12; 4 : 41; 5 : 42; 6 : 51)—impressions which necessarily obtained more during the early period of his work among the people, than during the later period, when he gave himself to the instruction of his disciples and to controversy with the religious leaders in Jerusalem.

5. Such a purpose naturally expressed itself in a characteristically vivid, and at the same time, simple narrative style. It is consequently noticeable that when words would add nothing to the depiction of the incident, the record is compressed (*e.g.* 1 : 2f.; 6 : 7-13; 8 : 10-13; 9 : 2-8; 10 : 2-12; 12 : 13-17); where they would give life and color to it, they are employed freely and without strict regard to rules of rhetoric (*e.g.* 1 : 40-45; 3 : 1-6; 5 : 1-20, 21-43; 6 : 14-29, 30-46; 8 : 1-9; 9 : 14-29; 10 : 46-52; 11 : 15-19, 20f.; 12 : 28-34); so that the Author comes to the frequent use of certain striking words, such as "straight-

¹ Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, p. 266.

INTRODUCTION

way," 42 times between chs. 1 and 9; 7 times between chs. 10 and 16; "astonished," 1 : 27; 10 : 24; "amazed," 9 : 15; "terrified," 16 : 5; "hardened," 6 : 52; 8 : 17; "question," "dispute," 1 : 27; 9 : 10, 14, 16, and often to the use of a word that gives a vividness to the incident, or a forceful point to the saying (e.g. "to stoop down," 1 : 7; "rent asunder," 1 : 10; "strictly charged him," 1 : 43; "looked round about," 5 : 32; "sat down in ranks"—lit. 'in groups of garden beds,' 6 : 40; "moored to the shore," 6 : 53; "behold them as trees, walking," 8 : 24; "taking in the arms in embrace," 9 : 36; 10 : 16; "casting away his garment," 10 : 50; "withered away from the roots," 11 : 20; "exceeding vehemently," 14 : 31). There is thus a minuteness of detail that makes the narrative a "reproduction rather than a representation" of the events. He has also a certain picturesque use of his tenses (e.g. the imperfect to represent the movement of the action, 5 : 18 [was beseeching]; 7 : 17 [were asking]; 15 : 47 [were beholding]; the present, to place the reader at the point of action, 2 : 1 [is in the house], while passages, such as 4 : 35-41; 6 : 30-51; 12 : 41-44; 14 : 53-55, where the present and the imperfect are interchanged with the aorist, as the narrative proceeds, are peculiarly vivid), and a fondness in the use of the direct form of speech (e.g. 1 : 37; 3 : 21; 4 : 39; 5 : 8, 12; 6 : 31; 9 : 25; 10 : 35; 16 : 3).¹ Were the Evangelists modern annalists, trained in the use of descriptive narrative, these characteristics would mean nothing more than that in our Second Gospel we had evidence of an Author who had mastered his art. But, whatever else the Evangelists were, they were not technical historians. Even the author of the Third Gospel was not a trained investigator of records, and, while he shows a literary ability which his fellow Evangelists do not possess, it is not employed in heightening the historical realism of the narrative which he presents, but, on the contrary, in smoothing it out into a polished story, fit for the cultured

¹ For added details, see Zahn, *Introduction*, vol. ii, p. 481, note (4).

INTRODUCTION

ears of his patron Theophilus. The vivid style of our Second Evangelist is significant, therefore, as indicating that the story he tells comes from sources which were in close contact with the events themselves.

6. As a result of this inductive study of the Gospel, it would seem that we should be justified in saying that it was written well within the Apostolic Age and by one who belonged to the Gospel Generation. In fact, if our Gospel be compared with the other two Synoptics in its phrasing of the apocalyptic discourse of ch. 13, the significant absence from it of any implication that the destruction of Jerusalem had taken place would seem to put the composition of the Gospel before 70 A.D.¹

II. THE TRADITION REGARDING THE GOSPEL

1. When we study the external testimony concerning the Gospel, we find its authorship uniformly assigned to the Mark mentioned in the New Testament as the companion of Saul and Barnabas during a portion of their first mission tour (Acts 12 : 25; 13 : 5), which, however, for some reason he abandoned (Acts 13 : 13f.); then later, because of Paul's refusal, as accompanying the latter on his separated mission journey to Cyprus (Acts 15 : 39f.); ² but in the earliest and latest references to him, as apparently associated with Peter, under whose influences his Christian life may have begun (Acts 12 : 12; 1 Pet. 5 : 13).

2. We find, moreover, that this testimony assigns the source of the Gospel's contents primarily to Peter. The way in which the Apostle furnished the material is variously described but is really determined by the state-

¹ Note verses 13f., 24, 30, 33, which seem to consider the fulfilment of the apocalyptic utterances as still in the future and lack such intimations of its accomplishment as seem to be present in Lk. 21 : 20, 24, or such evidence of the transference of it to the end of the world as appear in Matt. 24 : 3, 14, 29.

² For evidence of his reinstatement in Paul's favor and of further work with him, cf. Col. 4 : 10; Philem. ver. 24; 2 Tim. 4 : 11.

INTRODUCTION

ment of Papias, which is not only the earliest evidence bearing upon the point, but that from which all the following evidence has clearly been developed.¹ This statement of Papias is to the effect that Mark, while not a follower of Jesus in his ministry, had been with Peter in his mission work and having become his "interpreter"—a relation in this case not altogether easy to understand—had committed to writing what he could remember of the Apostle's Gospel addresses. These addresses were delivered, not with the purpose of presenting a gathered arrangement of the Lord's sayings, but in a way to suit the needs of each occasion, while the writing down of them was itself not in order.

3. This mention of the lack of order in Mark's writing has occasioned considerable discussion and has given rise to the theory that the writing Papias had in mind was not our Gospel but some fragmentary document, whose ill arranged contents Mark had gathered from Peter's discourses and which may have formed the basis for our Gospel, but which has been hopelessly lost. It is to be noted, however, that Papias' description of Mark's writing, from its wording in the original, refers to the lack rather of an orderly arrangement of its contents than an orderly sequence of its events,² and is doubtless due to the fact that the arrangement of Mark's writing was being compared with that of some other Gospel writing which was considered preferable to his.³

4. At the same time, it is to be admitted that while the

¹ This statement of Papias is preserved for us in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* (iii, 39).

² The element in which the writing was lacking is given as *τάξις*, which, as distinguished from *καθεξής*, implies arrangement, rather than sequence. (See Luke's use of the latter word in the prologue to his Gospel (1 : 3) and Plato's use of the former word in his *Republic* (637, E. Also note article by Colson in *Journal of Theological Studies*, Oct. 1912, pp. 62-69.)

³ Most likely Matthew's Gospel which is characterized by the grouping of its material, discourses as well as events.

INTRODUCTION

Gospel presents in general a consistently developed plan of Jesus' ministry and in the main current of its narrative is chronological in its sequence of sayings and events,¹ there is evidence of a tendency topically to group the material (*e.g.* 3 : 1-6, where the healing of the withered hand, which in view of its resultant combination of Pharisees and Herodians against Jesus, must have occurred much later, has been brought forward and placed with the early incident of the plucking of the grain—the only other incident of controversy over Sabbath observance this Gospel contains; also 3 : 22-30, where the presence of Jerusalemite scribes may possibly indicate that this attack has been interpolated into the incident of the anxiety of Jesus' family for his welfare [3 : 19b-21, 31-35], because of the association of the Beelzebub charge with the family's illusion as to Jesus' sanity; also 9 : 38-41 which may have been interpolated because of the common reference to ministry in Jesus' name, the thought of ver. 37 being clearly resumed at ver. 42). There are also to be recognized colorings of the narrative, which are evidently due to later doctrinal and apocalyptic points of view (*e. g.* 1 : 4, where the content of the Baptist's preaching is phrased in accordance with the Gospel preaching of the early Church [cf. Acts 2 : 38; 10 : 43; 13 : 38f.]; 4 : 10-12, where the reason given by Jesus for his use of parables is made to accord with the later Apostolic explanation of the puzzling rejection of Jesus' mission by the people of God [cf. Acts 2 : 23; 4 : 28; Rom. 11 : 7f., 25; 1 Pet. 2 : 8]—as is also present in 6 : 52; 7 : 19b-22, where Jesus' words are interpreted and the list of evils is determined in the light of such controversies as arose in the Apostolic Age [cf. 1 Cor. 6 : 12-20; 8; 10 : 23-33; Rom. 14; compare also Acts, 10 : 15 with such lists as are given in Gal. 5 : 19-21; Rom. 1 : 29-31; Eph. 4 : 19, 31; 5 : 3f.]; 9 : 41, where the disciples are to be known by the name of followers of Christ [cf.

¹ Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, pp. 29-33; Burkitt, *Earliest Sources of the Life of Jesus*, p. 88f.; Swete, *Mark*, pp. lii-lv.

INTRODUCTION

Acts 11 : 26; Rom. 8 : 9; 1 Cor. 3 : 23]; particularly, ch. 13, where we have in such passages as vs. 5-10, 12-14, 17-20, 22-27, 33, 37, a very general amplification and modification of Jesus' eschatological discourse, influenced by the Apocalyptic ideas present in the Church under the stress and strain of the impending catastrophe with which the Jewish war came to its close. There are also clearly present minor inaccuracies of statement (*e.g.* 1 : 39, where "throughout all Galilee" is manifestly inconsistent with the restricted region of the tour, as given in the preceding verse; 2 : 26, where "Abiathar" is given as the name of the high priest, instead of Ahimelech [cf. 1 Sam. 21 : 1]; 7 : 3ff., where the ablutions referred to are stated to have been practised by "all the Jews"—a manifest exaggeration as to their observance. There is also the more serious misstatement of 14 : 12, which identifies the Last Supper with the Passover Feast (cf. Lev. 23 : 5f.).¹

5. These facts, however, do not necessarily prove that the Markan writing to which Papias refers could not have been the Gospel as we have it before us to-day. Grouping of incidents may have been a feature of Peter's discourses—which were suited to the special occasions on which they were delivered; and such dogmatic and apocalyptic coloring of the narrative as discloses itself was present in the thought of the Apostolic Church of Mark's own day; while the errors are such as Mark himself may have committed. If he was a cousin of Barnabas, the Levite (Col. 4 : 10), he may have considered the practices which he saw observed in the circle of his family relations as observed generally by all, and so have made the exaggerated statement of 7 : 3ff.;² whereas if the identifying of the Last Supper with the Passover was due to the fact that the later Roman custom of regarding the Eucharist as a reproduction of the Paschal Meal had already begun,

¹ For a detailed analysis of the contents of the Gospel, see Moffatt, *New Testament Introduction*, pp. 221-225.

² Burkitt, *Sources*, p. 91f.

INTRODUCTION

this may be a confirmation of the tradition that Mark wrote his Gospel from Rome.¹ On the other hand, if such errors as 1 : 39 and 2 : 26 cannot be assigned to Mark, they are as likely due to misunderstanding and carelessness on the part of an early copyist, as to the deliberate work of a later redactor. Especially might this be so in the case of the proper name of 2 : 26 if we accept the suggestion that such hardly explainable names as Boanerges and Dalmanutha (3 : 17 and 8 : 10) are due to the fact that the copyist had a poorly legible exemplar with which to struggle.² Were the name originally written Abimelech, as in 1 Chron. 18 : 16, the mistake in a poorly written text might not have been impossible.

6. It is further admitted that the anecdotal character of the first half of the Gospel—up to 8 : 27—is in contrast to the definite sequence of the later half. This does not, however, necessitate that the material of the earlier narrative was drawn from fragmentary records current in the Church, rather than from Peter's preaching, nor that the developed character of the later narrative was wholly independent of the Apostle. For the purpose of illustration, Peter may have grouped incidents and sayings in his discourses; for the same purpose, he may have recited them singly and without definite time connection among themselves or with more than a general assignment of them to any one portion of the ministry. The fact that we have both the earlier and the later portions of the Gospel arranged in an order which discloses a distinct development in Jesus' work may be due to what was understood in the Church to have been the general progress of the ministry; but such an understanding must have been vague and confused in comparison with that had by one who had personally participated in the ministry, as the Apostle had done, and whether the Gospel was written during Peter's life or after it had ceased, Mark's associa-

¹ Bacon, *The Beginnings of Gospel Story*, p. xxixff., 195-198; Burkitt, *Sources*, pp. 92-94.

² Burkitt, *Sources*, p. 32f.

INTRODUCTION

tion with the Apostle must have made him familiar with the general sequence of the periods of the ministry and with the general development of its purpose and aim long before he committed these incidents and sayings to writing.

7. It is, of course, obvious that the contents of the Gospel did not originate directly with Peter in the sense of constituting them his personal Gospel. His early appearance in the narrative (cf. 1 : 16f., 29f.), together with his prominence in it (1 : 36; 3 : 16f.; 8 : 29f., 32f.; 9 : 2f.; 10 : 28; 11 : 21; 13 : 3; 14 : 29, 33, 37, 54, 66f.; 16 : 7) show him, not so much to have been the only source of the information,¹ as to have formed the personal atmosphere in which the commonly received traditions were reproduced.²

8. On the whole, however, the definite statement of patristic literature to the effect that the Gospel has come to us primarily from the preaching of Peter, through the authorship of Mark, is borne out by what we find in the study of its contents. Such editorial work as discloses itself is wholly of a minor importance (cf. 1 : 1 "the Son of God"; 6 : 30 "the apostles"; 8 : 35; 10 : 29 "and the Gospels") and for the purpose of discovering the sources of the Gospel, negligible.

¹ At the same time see Swete, *Mark*, p. lviii; Zahn, *Introduction*, vol. ii, pp. 494-498; Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, vol. ii, pp. 189-191, for evidence of personal Petrine details.

² See particularly the notes on the incorporated apocalypse of ch. 13. As to one or two individual incidents, Menzies (*The Earliest Gospel*, p. 28) considers that, on the basis of the identification of the Evangelist with the young man of 14 : 51f., certain facts in the narrative of the Jerusalem ministry, given alone in this Gospel, may have come from Mark himself (e.g. the mention of Alexander and Rufus, 15 : 21, who may have been personally known to him). See also Zahn (*Introduction*, vol. ii, pp. 490-494) as to information due to the reference of 14 : 51f. to the author. Burkitt (*Sources*, p. 97f.) suggests that the tale of the Gerasene demoniac came from sources across the Lake; while the source of the story of Herod and the Baptist (6 : 14-29) is impossible to locate.

INTRODUCTION

III. THE SOURCES OF THE GOSPEL

1. The theory, however, that a primary Markan writing underlies our present Gospel still persists and is vigorously urged by many scholars.

Its main contention is that whatever Petrine element entered into the original writing must have been conspicuously simple, and as such an element is evident in our Gospel, more or less artificially associated with relatively complex material, it is clear that in our canonical Gospel early and later sources lie before us which can be separated and to a measurable degree, at least, reconstructed.¹

2. That inequalities in the narrative exist—shown at times by compressions in the sequence of events, at times by dislocations of the chronological order; that some of the material is colored with later ideas—disclosed in phrases of Apostolic preaching and in viewpoints of the Apostolic Church; that inaccuracies of statement can be detected is obvious upon careful study of the Gospel's contents (see above, II. 4.). The question is simply whether these elements must necessarily have been imposed upon an original writing by a later hand. For this, no convincing proof has yet been produced. In fact, in proportion as we come clearly to understand the thought of the Early Church, it becomes increasingly evident that the primary interest of the first disciples did not lie in the historical past, but in the apocalyptic future (cf. 1 Thess. 1 : 9f.). Their attention was not given to gathering together the incidents of the Master's ministry, but in forecasting the outcome of the Master's predictions. Such a simple, matter-of-fact review of the Gospel history as is assumed to be characteristic of this original Markan writing would not be the natural product of the beginning period of the Apostolic Church; it is the outcome of a later

¹ For a display and review of the more notable analyses of the Gospel material on this theory, see Moffatt, *Introduction*, pp. 227-229.

INTRODUCTION

time when such faulty presentations of the sequence of events, such inaccuracies of statement and such colorings of Jesus' own ideas as we have before us in our present Gospel were quite possible.¹

3. It is claimed, however, that the evidence for a primary Markan writing does not lie so much in such relatively unimportant elements of the narrative as in its more significant features—such as a heightened supernaturalism, introduced to justify the Church's acceptance of Jesus as Divine; a veiled and secretive Messiahship, constructed to explain the Jewish rejection of Jesus as the Christ; and a theory of salvation, wrought into Jesus' teaching to make it accord with the Pauline doctrine of atonement.²

4. This claim deserves serious consideration; for it is clear that if it be well founded and these features be eliminated from the Gospel record, we have left a primary story which presents the life and work of Jesus in a light wholly different from that which has been accepted as historical by the Church. The question, of course, is whether it has ground on which it can stand.

5. Its first contention that the presence of exaggerated miracles, such as the healing of incurable disease (5 : 25-34), the feeding of a great multitude (6 : 35-44), the raising of the dead (5 : 35-43), are later additions in glorification of Jesus' power must clear itself of the suspicion of a purely philosophical bias. It may be true that if the miracles of the Gospel times had been wrought before the eyes of trained observers of the present day, we would have had

¹ See in general the view held by Burkitt of the eschatological tendencies of the Early Church (*The Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 60, 62, 164 f.; *Sources*, pp. 3-5), and the idea of the early origin of the apocalyptic element in the Gospel narratives presented by Streeter (*Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 425-430).

² See, for instance, one of the latest and most favorably received theories—that of Wendling, as given in his earlier pamphlet, *Urmärkus* (1905) and in his later and larger work, *Die Entstehung des Marcus Evangeliums* (1908).

INTRODUCTION

a different interpretation of them;¹ but the facts reported would have been the same. There would be no need of assuming a later date for such versions of them as are given; while we may not forget that of at least one of these "heightened miracles"—the reappearance of Jesus to his disciples after his death—an interpretation must be given even by modern scholars which will account for the present existence of the Christian Church.

6. The assertion that Jesus' concealment of his Messiahship from the crowds that followed him in his ministry and from the populace at large is a later reconstruction of the narrative, in order to explain how it was possible that the people of God did not recognize him as the Christ, fails to take account of the religious situation in which Jesus found himself in his ministry. The apocalyptic hope of Judaism in Jesus' time had in view a coming kingdom which was to be ushered in by God, when the time for the redemption of his people was ripe, and to be ruled over by the Messiah, when at last it was established. To bring it to its establishment was not the function of the Messiah. In fact, there was to be no Messiah until the kingdom was come. There was thus no Messiahship for Jesus to proclaim while he was announcing the kingdom to be "at hand." As God knew him and as the demons recognized him he may have been the Messiah, even in this preparatory stage; but to the people at large this was not possible. Unless he was to yield to the popular nationalism and lower his spiritual office to the rôle of a political pretender, Messiahship was not for him to announce or to allow to be announced until the coming of the kingdom had been realized in the hearts of men. His concealment of it during his early ministry; his acknowledgment of it to his chosen disciples after his spiritual instruction of them during the period of retirement had brought them to recognize it for themselves; his judicial assumption of it at the crisis of the

¹ Sanday, Article, Jesus Christ, in *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii, p. 625.

INTRODUCTION

final ministry in Jerusalem--these constitute a perfectly natural development of the Messianic feature of the narrative necessitated by the religious thinking of the day.¹

7. The final claim that into the teachings of Jesus has been introduced a theory of salvation in agreement with the Pauline theology begs the question as to whether Jesus' idea of salvation must necessarily have been different from Paul's. Confessedly, there is in Jesus' teachings a definite statement of redemption through the sacrifice of himself, and it is quite apparent that this is Paul's way of thinking. The only question is as to whether it could have been Jesus' way of thinking also. If Jesus' conception of his mission was that it was merely to champion the unchurched and the outcast of Judaism—that it was nothing more than a "religio-ethical and humanitarian" undertaking,² then there is no room in his teaching for a doctrine of atonement and the difference between the historical Christ and the Christ of Paul's experience is unthinkable wide. But the question is whether at this point of the significance of Jesus' death Paul's experience may not have been as truly in accord with the mind of the Master as was his Gentile activity in the matter of the purpose of the Master's mission to the world. Within nascent Christianity the development of the understanding of Christ and his work was as natural as it was within the embryonic discipleship of his Ministry, and unless the Christianity that has taken hold of the world can be accounted for without the Cross, then the announcement that the Son of Man came to give his life a ransom for many (10 : 45) is as historical a part of Jesus' teaching as it is a vital part of Paul's experience.

8. It would seem, therefore, from every point of view, that the existence of a primary Markan writing underlying our present Gospel fails of proof; so that the Gospel, practically as it stands before us, comes from Mark's hand.

¹ See Burkitt, *Sources*, p. 65.

² Bacon, *Gospel Story*, pp. xxxviii, 104, 107, 158.

INTRODUCTION

IV. THE RELATION OF MARK TO MATTHEW AND LUKE

1. There remains to be considered the literary relation of our Gospel to its fellow Synoptics—Matthew and Luke—particularly with reference to the query whether our Gospel may not have existed in one or more editions, revised perhaps by the hand of Mark himself.

2. From even a cursory study of the first three Gospels, it is clear that, while they are individual accounts of a commonly received story, they are not wholly independent accounts. There are portions of the narrative where they are so closely in agreement as to necessitate the conclusion, either that they have all been derived from a common written source, or that two of them have derived their accounts in common from the third; while there are other portions where two of the accounts are so verbally parallel as to compel the inference, either that they have drawn their material from a common document, or that one has used the account of the other.

3. Upon closer study of these accounts, however, it becomes clear that Mark stands in a peculiar relation to Matthew and Luke. Of his sixteen chapters there are less than thirty verses which are not to be found reproduced, more or less verbally, in the narratives of both, or of one or the other of his fellow Evangelists. Further than this, where Matthew or Luke differ from the narrative of Mark, the reason for their deviation is obvious; where Mark differs from either Matthew or Luke a reason for his procedure is not forthcoming. Even in the arrangement of the narrative, Matthew and Luke's digressions from his sequence are understandable, while his digression from either of theirs seems to have no explanation.

4. When investigation is made from another point of view, it is found that the three narratives arrange themselves in the following groups—a three-fold group, where the account is found in all the narratives; a two-fold group, where the account is found in two of the three—either in

INTRODUCTION

Matthew and Mark, or in Matthew and Luke, or in Mark and Luke; a single group, where the account is found but in one—either in Matthew, or in Mark, or in Luke. On a study of the three-fold group, it is discovered that Matthew and Mark agree against Luke and Mark and Luke agree against Matthew far more frequently and extensively than Matthew and Luke agree against Mark. In fact, the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark are confined to changes which in no way affect the sense or meaning of the record, save in the case of less than forty words throughout the entire extent of these groups. Even more striking results emerge in a study of the order of events within this three-fold group. Matthew and Mark agree against Luke in the location of two sections; Mark and Luke agree against Matthew in some thirteen sections. Matthew and Luke do not agree against Mark in a single instance.

5. From all these facts criticism has come to the very general conclusion that Mark's narrative and order of events form the basis for the narratives and order of Matthew and Luke—in other words, that when they wrote their gospels, Matthew and Luke had before them and used in their writing the Gospel of Mark substantially in the form in which it lies before us to-day.¹

6. It is obvious that this conclusion confirms that which has already been reached regarding the existence of a primary Markan writing, underlying our present Gospel of Mark (see above, III, 8). For if the Gospel which Matthew and Luke have so completely reproduced in their narratives were not our present Gospel of Mark, but a previous Markan writing which was used by all three, then it would be impossible to account for the fact that

¹ For a scientific study of the principles of literary criticism and their equally scientific application to the literary relations of the Synoptic Gospels, the reader is commended to the work of Professor Ernest DeWitt Burton, *Some Principles of Literary Criticism and their Application to the Synoptic Problem*, Chicago, 1904.

INTRODUCTION

Matthew and Luke have hardly ever copied it in agreement against our present Mark, except on the theory that it has been so completely reproduced in the present Gospel of Mark as to make his present Gospel identical with it—in other words, to show that there was no such primary Markan writing different from the present Markan Gospel as we possess it.¹

7. We have not considered, however, all the literary facts presented to us by these Gospels. As was noted above (4), some of the groups into which the three narratives divide themselves show that not only do Matthew and Mark have material which Luke has omitted and Mark and Luke have material which Matthew has omitted, but that Matthew and Luke have material which Mark has omitted. Can this material omitted by Mark have possibly belonged to a primary Markan writing?

8. There will be little doubt as to the answer to be given to this query when we consider the character of this material. It consists largely in sayings and discourses of Jesus with more or less narrative setting, and is marked in its identity of form of construction, wording of phrase and order of sentence. Its lack of agreement is in the locations in which it is placed in the narratives of the two Evangelists—there being but two instances in which it is similarly placed, viz.: the preaching of John the Baptist (Matt. 3 : 7-10, 12 = Lk. 3 : 7-9, 17) and the Temptation (Matt. 4 : 3-11 = Lk. 4 : 3-13). That this material belonged to a primary Markan writing and was as statedly discarded in the composition of our present Gospel of Mark as it was statedly appropriated in the composition of our present Gospels of Matthew and Luke is, not only highly improbable in itself as a literary procedure, but is rendered impossible by the fact that it came itself from more than one document.

9. Without going into the details of the argument by which this conclusion is reached, it will be sufficient to

¹ Burkitt, *Gospel History*, pp. 40-58.

INTRODUCTION

state that, as to the larger part of this common material, Matthew has distributed it through his narrative of the Galilean and Jerusalem ministries, including it in the long discourses peculiar to his Gospel, where it appears as an interrupting and discordant element; while Luke has segregated it in the ten chapters which give his record of what is called the Perean ministry.¹ It is clear from these different ways in which this material has been handled by these two Evangelists, that it represents a document distinct from Mark or any form of Mark. As to the smaller portion of this common material, it is placed by both Matthew and Luke in their respective records of the ministry of the Baptist and the Galilean ministry of Jesus and, though differently located in these records, it is arranged by both Evangelists in the same general sequence of events. Upon closer study, it is evident that this smaller portion of the common material does not come from the same document that furnished the larger portion. The narrative element in it is of a much more vivid character, while its literary style is of a much finer quality. In fact, when to this briefer material common to Matthew and Luke there is added from Luke's record of the Galilean ministry other material closely associated with it in its vividness of narration and its high quality of style, it is apparent that we have evidence of another document used by Luke, but in this case incorporated into his record of the Galilean ministry; while the excerpts taken from it by Matthew are confined to the same period in which it is used by Luke—evidently because, unlike the document constituting Luke's Perean record, it indicated in itself the period to which it belonged.

10. From the viewpoint of literary criticism, it is not

¹ While Luke has incorporated this document bodily into his narrative, in which it constitutes his Perean Chapters (9 : 51-18 : 14 and 19 : 1-28—the passage 18 : 15-43 being an interpolation from Mark), Matthew has given general excerpts from it, chiefly of the sayings of Jesus, which he has used to develop the larger discourses of the Master.

INTRODUCTION

possible that either of these two documents, representing together the material common to Matthew and Luke, formed part of a primary Markan writing; for, not only, as has already been said (3, above), is there no explanation of the stated omission of their material from our present Gospel of Mark, but in the case of the larger document, there is no assignable reason for the fact that in such a case both Matthew and Luke would have treated a portion of this primary writing in a way so distinctively different from that in which they treated the writing as a whole—Matthew omitting its narrative features and Luke congesting the order of its events in one period of the ministry. If it be said that this objection does not affect their treatment of the material of the smaller document—that, not only has Matthew here reproduced the narrative features of the material, but that both Matthew and Luke have distributed the material in an orderly sequence of events within the period of the Baptist's ministry and the Galilean ministry of Jesus, while the character of the narrative discloses the vividness which is characteristic of the Markan Gospel, it is nevertheless fatally against the theory that this document belonged to a primary Markan writing that a considerable portion of its material, as presented by Luke, displaces similar material in our present Gospel of Mark (Lk. 5 : 1-11 [Mk. 1 : 16-20]; Lk. 4 : 16-30 [Mk. 6 : 1-6]; Lk. 7 : 36-50 [Mk. 14 : 3-9])—in other words, that it was not reproduced from another writing of Mark's, but from a writing wholly separate and distinct from Mark's. From these facts it would seem as though there was no possible basis for positing the existence of a primitive Markan writing from which our present Gospel of Mark has been derived.

11. There remains but a single query: Recognizing the fact that both Matthew and Luke made common use of Mark, is it possible that the Markan material possessed by one of these two Evangelists and not by the other means that one of them had a copy of our present Gospel

INTRODUCTION

of Mark which was not used by the other? There is a very significant section of Mark's Gospel (6 : 45-8 : 26) which has been substantially reproduced by Matthew, but is not found at all in Luke. Could this have belonged to the copy of Mark which was used by Matthew but not to that which was used by Luke? It is claimed that only so can the omission of such a large section be accounted for.¹ If so, it would necessitate that Matthew followed Luke in order of composition—a sequence for which Harnack argues from other data.² It would, however, oblige us also to assume that this section of the second Gospel was added to the earlier copy of the Gospel by Mark himself; since its uniformity in language and style with the rest of the Gospel precludes the possibility of its having been inserted by one who was distinct from the author of the book as a whole.³ This, too, is not an absolutely impossible procedure. But the question arises whether the omission is not better accounted for by the fact that the motive for the period of retirement and instruction contained in these chapters of Mark would so lack in its appeal to the historian Luke—especially when account is taken of his tendency toward a Gentile broadening of Jesus' ministry—that there would be no inclination on his part to incorporate them in his narrative. Had these omitted chapters recorded an organized ministry throughout this Gentile region on Jesus' part, they would have been eagerly reproduced by Luke; as this, however, is expressly what they exclude, it is not difficult to understand why he passed them by.⁴

12. In the narrative of the Passion and Resurrection there is a considerable portion which Luke has peculiar

¹ Wright, *Synopsis*, 2d Ed., p. lviii; *Gospel of St. Luke*, p. 83.

² *Date of Acts and the Synoptic Gospels*, Ch. III, §§ 6, 8.

³ For details of the argument that this section forms an integral part of Mark's Gospel, see Hawkins in *Oxford Studies*, pp. 63-66.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 72-74. For another theory as to Luke's reason for omitting this section, see Burton, *Principles of Literary Criticism*, p. 45.

INTRODUCTION

to himself and not in common with Matthew. Were this material present in Mark, it might raise the question whether, assuming that Matthew was written before Luke, he possessed an earlier copy of Mark not used by Luke. But, not only is this material of Luke's not present in Mark, but there is an equally considerable portion of Matthew's Passion and Resurrection narrative which is not to be found either in Luke or in Mark—showing that the question which confronts us in this part of the Gospel story is, not whether there existed an earlier copy of Mark which one of the other Evangelists used and the other did not have, but whether Matthew and Luke did not each have and use a source distinct from Mark and peculiar to himself.

13. As is well known, there is a large amount of material distributed through Matthew which is peculiar to that Gospel. It consists of long discourses and shorter sayings of Jesus, derived from a document which was most likely a collection of Jesus' utterances. The existence of such a document is credited to us by the reference which Papias makes to a book of "the sayings" (*Logia*) written by Matthew in the Hebrew (Aramaic) dialect.¹ Whether this document was used also by Mark, in spite of the fact that this Evangelist records so few of Jesus' teachings, or even by Luke, who records so much of this discourse material, is a question which at present is debated by scholars, and, as far as Mark is concerned, does not affect the primary character of his Gospel as we have it before us to-day.²

14. It would seem, therefore, from all these facts that there is no evidence, amounting to proof, that, while both Matthew and Luke used what we know as our Gospel of Mark, one of them used an earlier and simpler edition of

¹ Eusebius, *History*, iii, 39.

² For a discussion of the question as to Mark's use of this document, see Streeter, *Oxford Studies*, pp. 165-183; for a discussion of the use of this document by either Mark or Luke, see Burton, *Principles of Literary Criticism*, pp. 35-41.

INTRODUCTION

it than was used by the other. The Gospel of Mark, then, as it exists in its present canonical form—apart from a few unimportant editorial additions (see above, II, 8)—is the Gospel writing to which Papias refers in his statement preserved for us in Eusebius' *History* (above, II, 2, note [2]).

V. THE DATE OF MARK

1. We come thus to the question as to when this Gospel of Mark was written. If we recur to Papias' basal testimony (above, II, 2), we find that it does not necessarily imply that this Gospel writing of Mark was accomplished after Peter's death. Fairly interpreted, it means merely that it was, not a reporting of the Apostle's discourses as they were being delivered, but a writing down of what was remembered of them after they had ceased to be given. Such a process, of course, would be as well satisfied by the fact that Mark was no longer in Peter's company, as by the fact that Peter was no longer alive. If, however, as has been already pointed out (above, II, 5), Mark composed his Gospel in Rome, in order that those to whom the Apostle had ministered might have in some narrative form the incidents of the Gospel story which had been scattered through his discourses, then, on the supposition that the interpretation of the apocalyptic material of Ch. 13 given in the notes is correct, the composition of the Gospel is almost necessarily brought down to a date not long preceding the catastrophe of 70 A.D. and, therefore, some considerable time after the traditional date of Peter's martyrdom (64 A.D.).¹ At all events, it is to be assigned to the later rather than to the earlier years of the sixth decade.

¹ Though the view regarding the apocalyptic discourse advanced in the notes to Ch. 13 is of the same general character as that held by Stanton (*Gospels as Historical Documents*, vol. ii, p. 117), it is nevertheless different and calls for a later date of composition than 60 A. D., which he assigns to it (p. 120). At the same time, it necessitates a date early enough to allow for the document having secured such currency in the church as to commend it to Mark's use.

INTRODUCTION

VI. THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF MARK

1. Obviously, it is not a collection of a few unrelated anecdotes of the Gospel story, embellished with legendary and mythical anecdotes, or padded out with doctrinal polemics. It lies before us, on the whole, an intelligible outline of a consistently developed life and work, which, in perfect accord with the political and religious conditions of the time, was only gradually understood by its sympathetic followers and to its enemies remained an irrational challenge of self-assumption to the end.

2. Here and there we find in it inaccuracies of statement, born of the thirty or more years by which it was removed from the events which it records; we come across phrasings which belong to the Apostolic preaching with which Mark was familiar; there are even points where the later hand of an editor is evident. But none of these blemishes affects the historical consistency of the narrative as a whole. The supernatural is present in the story; but it is not imposed upon it in a spirit of a later superstition; it is there as naturally interpreted by those who saw it, whether that interpretation be held to-day as scientific or not. The divine is present in the claims which Jesus centres upon himself; but it is not there as a later dogmatic dress which has been thrown over the simple ethical and social conceptions which he had of his mission. Read the Gospel record as a later legend and myth recast in the form of history, and it becomes unintelligible. Conceive of Jesus as a mere ethical and social reformer, whose claim to redeem the sin of the world and to command its religious life is a dogmatic conception of a later age, and the course of his mission as recounted in the narrative is absurd.

3. On the other hand, when we recognize the Gospel of Mark as a sober record of the facts of Jesus' message and ministry as they occurred, we begin to realize why this particular Gospel occupied so relatively small a place in the estimation of post apostolic literature. It lacked, not

INTRODUCTION

merely those elements of literary style which ranked it below its companion Synoptics, but those features of doctrinal interpretation which would interest the age in which the Church Fathers wrought and wrote. It was nothing but the simple story which had long ago been known and told abroad; but in this it has for us its supreme historical worth.¹ With the facts of this simple story of Jesus' ministry and message tallied the simple faith which the Early Church yielded to Jesus himself. But the faith did not create the facts; it was the facts that gave birth to the faith, and just because, as that faith grew complicated through the controversies of a developed theology, it lost interest in the facts, it is to these facts that it has ever had to return, in order to recover the strength and the power with which it began.

4. If to these impressions is added the conclusion which criticism has justified—that the story told in this Gospel has a vital relation to the personal participation in its events on the part of one of Jesus' intimate disciples, there comes to us an even deeper conviction of the historical worth of what it narrates;² for if this story is not an illusion which has arisen out of the faith of the early disciples, much less can it be an illusion created by the faith of any one of them. What Peter held in his faith in Jesus was held in a faith which, in spite of all their many independencies of view, he had in common with them all. If the Gospel story of Mark was not the product of the faith of the entire Church, it is not thinkable that it was the product of the faith of one of the members of the Church, however prominent he may have been; for then his faith must have created, not only its own historical illusions, but the historical illusions on which rested the belief of the Church at large; for this Gospel became the accepted history for the Christian discipleship of the Apostolic Age,

¹ Burkitt, *Gospel History*, ch. iii, *Sources*, ch. iii; Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, pp. 4-19.

² Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, pp. 159-168.

INTRODUCTION

and whatever leadership may be claimed for Peter among the early disciples, there were too many in this discipleship who could have checked up the illusions of such a self-created story of Jesus' life and work, to make it possible for him through it to become the founder of the Christian faith. If Paul did not come to his belief in the resurrection of Jesus through the unverifiable illusions of the early disciples at large (1 Cor. 15 : 1-8), it is not likely that he was persuaded to it by those of one of their number, and Paul was but a type of the bigotedly hostile mind that had to be persuaded by fact to forsake an ingrained unbelief for a life constraining faith.

VII. THE TEXT

1. The only serious question as to the text of the Gospel is raised by the fact that in the ancient MSS. and Versions the concluding chapter appears in three very differing forms. In the larger number of these documents we have the longer form presented to us in the Authorized Version; in the smaller number we have the shorter form given in the Revised Version, which omits everything after verse 8; in a few we have an intermediate form, which substitutes for vs. 9-20 of the longer form a short paragraph, consisting of the following two sentences: *And they reported briefly to Peter and those in his company all the things commanded. And after these things Jesus himself also sent forth through them from the East even to the West the holy and incorruptible message of eternal salvation.* Some of these latter manuscripts contain both forms as alternative endings; while the text of the recently discovered Freer manuscript contains an extended variant of the longer form (cf. *Biblical World*, 1908, pp. 138-142, 218-226).

2. There is little difficulty, however, in deciding among these different forms. The intermediate form has no manuscript evidence of value and is wholly discredited by its character and the uncertainty of its use; while the longer form, although it has an overwhelming majority of docu-

INTRODUCTION

mentary witnesses in its favor, supplemented by the writings of Irenæus, who accepts it without suspicion, and by those of Justin Martyr and earlier still by Barnabas and Hermas, who seem to know of it, though not necessarily as part of the Gospel, yet this weight of numbers is more than offset by the testimony of the two oldest Uncials (Sinaitic and Vatican) and of one of the two earliest forms of the Syriac Version (Sinaitic Syriac), all of which close the Gospel at verse 8. In addition to this, is the significant silence of Patristic Literature, from Irenæus to Eusebius, as to anything following verse 8 and the positive statement on the part of Eusebius, repeated later by Jerome, that this was the form existent, not only in almost all the MSS. of his day, but in all that were considered the most accurate.

3. This external evidence is confirmed by a study of verses 9-20 of the longer form. Their connection with the preceding verses is hopelessly artificial. Not only does verse 9 needlessly take the narrative back to verse 1, but there is nothing to explain how the great fear recorded in verse 8 as having paralyzed the speech of the women transformed itself into the message of verse 10; nor is there any mention of an appearing of Jesus in Galilee which would be naturally expected from the promise of verse 7 (cf. *per contra* Matt. 28 : 16, as related to 28 : 7). Further than this, the style of these verses is strikingly at variance with that of the rest of the Gospel. It is not that of a vivid narrative which so characterizes the writing of this Evangelist, but that of a summarizing statement, influenced apparently by confessional and catechetical usage. Also, the language shows itself in several instances to be wholly foreign to Mark, and in some of them to the entire New Testament (e.g. "the first day of the week," ver. 9, the original of which is unique in the New Testament; "the Lord [Jesus]," vs. 19, 20, a term never elsewhere applied to the Master, either in Mark or in Matthew and only rarely in Luke and John; also the original terms for

INTRODUCTION

going and walking [vs. 10, 12, 15], *accompanying* [ver. 17], *deadly, hurting* [ver. 18], *working with and confirming* [ver. 20] are all strange to Mark and some of them to the New Testament).

4. What was the origin of this longer form may be impossible to state. From an Armenian MS. recently discovered,¹ it would seem that it came from the hand of Aristion the "presbyter"—doubtless identical with one of the authorities upon whom Papias depended for his information; while the presence of an extended variant of this longer form in the significant Freer MS. of the fifth century—the interpolated portion of which was known to Jerome—may indicate that these verses were not written primarily to furnish an ending for the Gospel, but were taken from a larger work to serve this purpose. But whether Aristion was the author of this larger work, or the editor of what was borrowed from it for this ending, or whether this ending was taken from the famous work of Papias—Aristion being indicated as the source of the particular information which these verses contain, is, in the present stage of the discussion, beyond definite determination.²

5. Whether this short form—ending at verse 8—was the form given the conclusion of his narrative by Mark himself, or whether, as the Gospel left his hand it had a longer ending which in the first years of the Gospel's usage was lost or removed, may be difficult to decide; though it is easier to account for the addition of these other endings, if it never had any of its own than for the substitution of these for that which it originally had. It may be that Mark intended to add an extended narrative covering the establishing of that Gospel the beginning of which he had narrated in his record so far—especially if he was conscious

¹ Conybeare, *Expositor*, Oct. 1893, pp. 241-254, Dec. 1895, pp. 401-421.

² For full discussion of the whole question, see Zahn, *Introduction*, vol. ii, pp. 467-480; Moffat, *Introduction*, pp. 238-242.

INTRODUCTION

of having obtained this record from the Apostolic proclamation of the Gospel so established. What Luke did in an extended form is evidence of what might have been done more briefly by Mark and of what the Editor of Matthew's "sayings" would have had no inclination to do.

VIII. ANALYSIS

- I. INTRODUCTORY, giving the Preparation for the Ministry; 1 : 1-13.
 - (A) The Ministry of John the Baptist; 1 : 1-8.
 - (B) The Induction of Jesus into His work; 1 : 9-13.
 - (1) The Baptism; 1 : 9-11.
 - (2) The Temptation; 1 : 12f.
- II. THE PUBLIC MINISTRY; 1 : 14-Ch. 13.
 - 1. *The Popular Work in Galilee*; 1 : 14-7 : 23.
 - = Departure into Galilee, upon announcement of the imprisonment of the Baptist—Theme of His message; 1 : 14f.
 - (A) The call of the four Disciples; 1 : 16-20.
 - (B) The opening day of the Capernaum Ministry; 1 : 21-34.
 - = Withdrawal for prayer, preparatory to a circuit of the suburban villages of Capernaum, with the healing of the Leper; 1 : 35-45.
 - (C) Return to Capernaum and work from that centre; 2 : 1-7 : 23.
 - (1) The healing of the Paralytic, with accompanying discourse; 2 : 1-12.
 - = Withdrawal to the seaside followed by crowds; 2 : 13.
 - (2) The call of Levi—Feast in his house—Discourse; 2 : 14-22.
 - (3) The Sabbath journey through the grain field—Discourse; 2 : 23-28.
 - (4) The Sabbath healing of the Man with the Withered Hand, with discourse; 3 : 1-5.

INTRODUCTION

- (5) The Council of Pharisees and Herodians against him; 3 : 6.
 - = Connecting narrative—giving.
 - (a) Withdrawal of Jesus to the seaside; 3 : 7a.
 - (b) Following of the multitude—Account of miracles; 3 : 7b-10.
 - (c) Recognition of Messiahship by unclean spirits and Jesus' restriction upon their proclamation of it; 3 : 11f.
- (6) The choice of the Twelve; 3 : 13-19.
 - = Crowds gather and friends [family] consider Him mad; 3 : 20f.
- (7) The Beelzebub charge of the Pharisees—Answering discourse; 3 : 22-30.
- (8) The visit of His Mother and Brethren—Accompanying remarks; 3 : 31-35.
- (9) The Day of Parables by the seaside; 4 : 1-34.
 - = Opening verses; 4 : 1f.
 - (a) The parable of the Sower, with explanation; 4 : 3-20.
 - = Personal responsibilities; 4 : 21-25.
 - (b) The parable of the Good Seed; 4 : 26-29.
 - (c) The parable of the Mustard Seed; 4 : 30-32.
 - = Closing verses; 4 : 33f.
 - = Withdrawal to the other side of the Lake—the Storm and its stilling; 4 : 35-41.
- (10) The Gerasene Demoniac; 5 : 1-20.
 - = Return to Capernaum—Many gather around Him; 5 : 21.
- (11) Jairus' Daughter and the Woman by the way; 5 : 22-43.
 - = Departure to Nazareth; 6 : 1.
- (12) The rejection in Nazareth; 6 : 2-6a.
- (13) A Third Preaching Tour; 6 : 6b-13.

INTRODUCTION

- (14) Herod's opinion of Jesus, connected with which is an account of the Baptist's imprisonment and death; 6 : 14-29.
= Return of the Twelve—Report of their work—Withdrawal to a desert place, followed by crowds—Jesus' compassion; 6 : 30-33.
- (15) The feeding of the Five Thousand; 6 : 34-44.
= Departure of the Disciples across the Lake—Dismissal of the multitude—Withdrawal of Jesus to a mountain to pray—Storm on the Lake—Jesus' appearance and resultant calm—Arrival at Genessaret—Reception by the people and work in this region; 6 : 45-56.
- (16) Ceremonial criticism of the Pharisees and the Scribes—Answering discourse; 7 : 1-23.
2. *The Period of Retirement into the Regions of Tyre and Sidon and the Decapolis*; 7 : 24-8 : 26.
= Withdrawal into the region of Tyre and Sidon; 7 : 24.
- (1) The Daughter of the Syro-Phœnician woman; 7 : 25-30.
= Region of the Decapolis; 7 : 31.
- (2) The Deaf and Dumb healed; 7 : 32-37.
- (3) The feeding of the Four Thousand; 8 : 1-9.
= Region of Dalmanutha; 8 : 10.
- (4) The Pharisees' tempting request for a Sign—Jesus' reply; 8 : 11f.
= Departure to other side of Lake; 8 : 13.
- (5) Jesus' warning against the leaven of the Pharisees; 8 : 14-21.
= Bethsaida; 8 : 22.
- (6) The Blind Man healed; 8 : 23-26.
3. *The Instructional Work*; 8 : 27-10 : 52.
- (A) In the Decapolis; 8 : 27-9 : 29.
= Cæsarea Philippi; 8 : 27.

INTRODUCTION

- (1) Peter's Confession—Rebuke of Jesus—Discourse by Jesus on Discipleship; 8 : 27-9 : 1.
- (2) The Transfiguration and Jesus' announcement of the Passion; 9 : 2-13.
- (3) The Epileptic boy; 9 : 14-29.
- (B) On the last Journeys to Jerusalem; 9 : 30-10 : 52.
 - = Return through Galilee; 9 : 30.
- (1) Renewed announcement of the Passion; 9 : 31f.
 - = Coming to Capernaum; 9 : 33.
- (2) The Dispute of the Disciples—Instruction by Jesus through the object-lesson of the child; 9 : 33-50.
 - = In the region of Perea; 10 : 1.
- (3) The tempting question of the Pharisees regarding divorce; 10 : 2-12.
- (4) The bringing of young children to Him to be blessed; 10 : 13-16.
- (5) The question of the Rich Young Man; 10 : 17-22.—Resulting discourse; 10 : 23-27.—Instruction of the Twelve; 10 : 28-31.
 - = Further stage of the journey; 10 : 32a.
- (6) Renewed announcement of the Passion; 10 : 32b-34.
- (7) The ambitious request of the Sons of Zebedee; 10 : 35-45.
 - = At Jericho; 10 : 46a.
- (8) The Blind Man healed; 10 : 46b-52.
- 4. *The Messianic Work in Jerusalem*; Chs. 11-13.
 - = Drawing near to Jerusalem; 11 : 1f.
 - (1) The Public Entry into the City; 11 : 2-11a.
 - = Departure to Bethany and return on the following morning; 11 : 11b.
 - (2) The miracle of the Fig Tree; 11 : 12-14.
 - = Return to Jerusalem—Temple; 11 : 15a.

INTRODUCTION

- (3) The cleansing of the Temple; 11 : 15b-18.
= Departure to Bethany; 11 : 19.
- (4) The withered Fig Tree, with explanatory discourse; 11 : 20-25.
= Return again to Jerusalem; 11 : 27a.
- (5) The demand for Christ's authority by the Jews—Answering discourse; 11 : 27-33.
- (6) The parable of the Husbandman; 12 : 1-12.
- (7) The tempting question of the Pharisees and the Herodians regarding tribute; 12 : 13-17.
- (8) The tempting question of the Sadducees regarding marriage; 12 : 18-27.
- (9) The tempting question of a Scribe regarding the chief commandment; 12 : 28-34.
- (10) The concrete question of Jesus regarding David's words about Christ; 12 : 35-37.
- (11) The warning against the Scribes; 12 : 38-40.
- (12) The Widow's Mite; 12 : 41-44.
- (13) The Apocalyptic Discourse; Ch. 13.

III. THE PASSION AND RESURRECTION; 14 : 1-16 : 8 [Vs. 9-20 = later addition].

- (1) The Conspiracy of the Rulers, the Supper at Bethany and the Treachery of Judas; 14 : 1-11.
- (2) The Last Supper; 14 : 12-25.
- (3) The Departure to the Mount of Olives, with the Foretelling of the Desertion and the Denial; 14 : 26-31.
- (4) The Agony in Gethsemane; 14 : 32-42.
- (5) The Arrest; 14 : 43-52.
- (6) The Trial Before the Sanhedrin; 14 : 53-72.
- (7) The Trial Before Pilate; 15 : 1-20.
- (8) The Crucifixion; 15 : 21-41.
- (9) The Burial; 15 : 42-47.

INTRODUCTION

(10) The Visit of the Women to the Tomb; 16 : 1-8.

Later Added Ending; 16 : 9-20.

Note: The symbol = is used to designate the smaller paragraphs which serve, generally speaking, to connect the main passages of the narrative.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

INTRODUCTION

- BACON, BENJAMIN W. An Introduction to the New Testament, New Testament Handbooks, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1900, Chs. VIII and IX.
- BURTON, ERNEST DEWITT. A Short Introduction to the Gospels, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1904, Chs. I-IV.
- JÜLICHER, ADOLF. An Introduction to the New Testament, Eng. Trans., New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904, Book III, Ch. I, §§ 24-29.
- ZAHN, THEODOR. An Introduction to the New Testament, Eng. Trans., 3 Vols., Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1909, Vol. II, Ch. IX.
- PEAKE, ARTHUR S. A Critical Introduction to the New Testament, Studies in Theology, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910, Ch. XII.
- MOFFATT, JAMES. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, International Theological Library, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911, Ch. II.
- WRIGHT, ARTHUR. The Composition of the Four Gospels, London, Macmillan & Co., 1890, Chs. I-III, V-XIV, XVII.
- ROBINSON, J. ARMITAGE. The Study of the Gospels, Handbooks for the Clergy, London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1902, Chs. I-IV.

STUDY

- DU BUISSON, J. C. The Origin and Peculiar Characteristics of the Gospel of St. Mark, London, Froude, 1896.
- STANTON, VINCENT H. The Gospels as Historical Documents, 2 Vols., Cambridge, University Press, 1903-1909, Vol. II.
- BURTON, ERNEST DEWITT. Some Principles of Literary Criticism and Their Application to the Synoptic Problem, Decennial Publications of Chicago University, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1904.
- BURKITT F. CRAWFORD. The Gospel History and its Transmission, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1906, Chs. I-IV.
- SALMON, GEORGE. The Human Element in the Gospels, New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1907.

INTRODUCTION

- HARNACK, ADOLF. The Sayings of Jesus, New Testament Studies, Eng. Trans., New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908, Ch. II.
- HAWKINS, SIR JOHN C. *Horæ Synopticæ*, 2d Ed., Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1909, pp. 1-173.
- BURKITT, F. CRAWFORD. The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus, Modern Religious Problems, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1910.
- HARNACK, ADOLF. The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels, New Testament Studies, Eng. Trans., New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911, Ch. III, §§ 6-8.
- SANDAY, WILLIAM (Editor). Studies in the Synoptic Problem, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911.
- HOLDSWORTH, WILLIAM W. Gospel Origins, Studies in Theology, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913, Chs. I and V.

COMMENTARY

- MACLEAR, G. F. The Gospel According to St. Mark, Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, Cambridge University Press, 1877.
- GOULD, EZRA, P. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark, International Critical Commentary, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896.
- BRUCE, ALEXANDER B. The Synoptic Gospels, The Expositor's Greek Testament, New York, Dodd, Mead & Co., 1897.
- SWETE, HENRY B. The Gospel According to St. Mark, London, Macmillan & Co., 1898.
- MACLEAR, G. F. The Gospel According to St. Mark, Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges, Cambridge University Press, 1899.
- MENZIES, ALLAN. The Earliest Gospel, London, Macmillan & Co., 1901.
- BOSANQUET, B. H., and WENHAM, R. A. Outlines of the Synoptic Record, New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1904.
- DU BUISSON, J. C. The Gospel According to St. Mark, The Churchman's Bible, London, Methuen & Co., 1906.
- BACON, BENJAMIN W. The Beginnings of Gospel Story, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1909.
- MONTEFIORE, C. A. The Synoptic Gospels, 3 Vols., London, Macmillan & Co., 1909.
- CHADWICK, G. A. The Gospel According to St. Mark, The Expositor's Bible, New York, Hodder & Stoughton (n. d.).
- LINDSAY, THOMAS M. The Gospel According to St. Mark, Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark (n. d.).
- GREEN, S. W. The Gospel According to St. Mark, The Westminster New Testament, New York, Fleming H. Revell Co. (n. d.).

INTRODUCTION

SALMOND, D. D. F. St. Mark, The New Century Bible, New York, Henry Froude (n. d.).

LIVES

- BENNETT, W. H. The Life of Christ according to St. Mark, The Expositor's Library, London, Hodder & Stoughton (n. d.).
- EDERSHEIM, ALFRED. The Life & Times of Jesus the Messiah, 4th ed., New York, A. D. F. Randolph & Co. (n. d.).
- ANDREWS, SAMUEL J. The Life of Our Lord upon the Earth, 2d ed., New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891.
- WEISS, BERNHARD. The Life of Christ, Eng. Trans., Clark's Foreign Theological Library, 3 Vols., Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1894.
- GILBERT, GEORGE HOLLEY. The Student's Life of Jesus, 3d Ed., New York, The Macmillan Co., 1900.
- RHEES, RUSH. The Life of Jesus of Nazareth, The Historical Series for Bible Students, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900.
- HOLTZMANN, OSCAR. The Life of Jesus, London, Adam & Charles Black, 1904.
- SANDAY, WILLIAM. Outlines of the Life of Christ, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.
- SMITH, DAVID. The Days of his Flesh, New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1905.

THEOLOGY

- GARVIE, ALFRED E. Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus, New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son (n. d.).
- BRUCE, ALEXANDER B. The Galilean Gospel, New York, Macmillan & Co., 1882.
- STEVENS, GEORGE B. The Theology of the New Testament, International Theological Library, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.
- GILBERT, GEORGE HOLLEY. The Revelation of Jesus, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1899.
- SWETE, HENRY B. Studies in the Teaching of Our Lord, New York, Edwin S. Gorham, 1904.
- KNOX, GEORGE WILLIAM. The Gospel of Jesus the Son of God, Modern Religious Problems, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1909.
- DENNEY, JAMES. Jesus and the Gospel, New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1909.
- HOGG, A. G. Christ's Message of the Kingdom, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1911.
- MOFFATT, JAMES. The Theology of the Gospels, Studies in Theology, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK

I. INTRODUCTION 1: 1-13

(A) *The Ministry of John the Baptist* 1: 1-8

1. The beginning of the ¹ gospel of Jesus Christ,² the Son of God.
2. Even as it is written ³ in Isaiah the prophet,
Behold, I send my messenger before thy face,
Who shall prepare thy way;
3. The voice of one crying in the wilderness,
Make ye ready the way of the Lord,
Make his paths straight;

¹ *Good tidings.*

² Some MSS. omit *the Son of God*.

³ Some MSS. read *in the prophets*.

1. **The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God:** The Evangelist's introduction to his narrative, after the manner of Prov. 1 : 1 and Song 1 : 1; (cf. Hos. 1 : 2 [LXX]). It is connected through the medium of the citation in vs. 2, 3, with the opening statement in ver. 4, giving the sense: The beginning of the Gospel message of Jesus Christ came through the Baptist's heralding in the wilderness the baptism of repentance, a ministry which was in accord with Old Testament prophecy; so that this coming of the Baptist in fulfilment of prophecy indicated the beginning of the Gospel message. **Gospel** is here used in a more technical sense than in 1 : 14f.; 13 : 10; 14 : 9, under the formulating influence of the Apostolic preaching (cf. 8 : 35; 10 : 29).

2, 3. The Evangelist cites Mal. 3 : 1 and Isa. 40 : 3, referring both passages to Isaiah (cf. Matt. 21 : 4f.), either grouping them under the more important source, in indifference to exactness of such excerpts as existed in his day (Hatch, *Essays*, p. 203ff.), or copying them as they stood in some such collection. In either case, he gives them with

4. John came, who baptized in the wilderness and preached the baptism of repentance unto remission of
5. sins. And there went out unto him all the country

those changes in phrase, which were due to the adaptation to New Testament times of what were considered the Messianic predictions of Scripture. Such adaptation of these passages is quite likely to have been in accord with the Baptist's own interpretation of his mission (cf. Jn. 3 : 28).

4. **Who baptized in the wilderness:** The words "who baptized" are really a phrase descriptive of John, and should be rendered, "the baptizer," the remaining words, "in the wilderness," being connected with the following "and preached," properly rendered "preaching." The entire clause thus reads: "Then came John, the Baptizer, preaching in the wilderness the baptism of repentance." **The baptism of repentance unto remission of sins:** This purports to give the content of the Baptist's message. It is evident, however, that just in proportion as the Baptist considered himself in the line of the Old Testament prophets, he looked upon his work as national and not as individual, and just so far as we have record of his preaching, it was general and not individual, a class-preaching rather than an individually personal preaching (cf. Lk. 3 : 7, 10, 12f.). Consequently, though the requirements which he imposed made the repentance one of personal life and not of a mere ceremony, yet this was what the Prophets had done in their national conception of their mission. This phrase, however, particularly in its unique portion ("unto remission of sins"), expresses the conception of individual repentance and individual forgiveness which was characteristic of the Apostolic preaching (cf. Acts 2 : 38; 10 : 43; 13 : 38f.); so that, while it doubtless represents what was latent in the Baptist's message, it presents it in the form which belonged distinctively to the later Christian thought. We get a better idea of what the Baptist's message was from Matthew's record (3 : 2, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand"). He began with an emphasis upon the prophetic idea of the Messianic reign and rule ("kingdom") which was to be established, coming to the announcement of the personal Messiah as he became conscious of the people's increasing tendency to believe that he himself was the Christ (Lk. 3 : 15f.).

5. **All the country of Judea and all they of Jerusalem**—a general statement for the popular success of his mission (Mk. 11 : 32), the details of which are better given in Luke (3 : 10-15). It is not to be forgotten that the religious leaders did not believe in him (Mk. 11 : 27-33), as we can easily understand from his denunciation of them (Matt. 3 : 7-10 and Lk. 11). This popular outpouring was due,

of Judæa, and all they of Jerusalem; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their
 6. sins. And John was clothed with camel's hair, and *had* a leathern girdle about his loins, and did eat
 7. locusts and wild honey. And he preached, saying, There cometh after me he that is mightier than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am not ¹ worthy to stoop

¹ Grk. *sufficient*.

not merely to the desire for a revival of prophecy (cf. Matt. 11 : 9; 1 Mac. 4 : 46; 14 : 41), but to the greater hope of national deliverance which the people would be quick to foresee in the call to national repentance. **Baptized:** The Baptist's rite symbolized the purification of the people's lives and therefore must have been largely influenced by the Old Testament purification rites; but it symbolized this purification in preparation for the entirely new condition to be brought about by the Messianic coming, and consequently must have involved the idea contained in the rite of proselyte initiation. This makes clear that the form must have been, not only that of affusion (purification), but of immersion (initiation).

6. The Baptist's dress was that which had been distinctive of Elijah (2 Kings 1 : 8) and perhaps had become the traditional prophetic garb (cf. Zech. 13 : 4). The garment is described as of **camel's hair**, by which we are to understand not a skin, but a coarse garment woven from the rough hair of the animal. His food was simply such as was conditioned by his wilderness life—certain kinds of locusts being allowed as food (Lev. 11 : 22), and wild-bee honey being plentiful in this region (Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 88).

7. **Mightier than I:** This represents the earlier idea of Jesus which the Baptist had—the *relatively greater* man, though doubtless from the spiritual point of view, as is evident from the following verse. The later idea came through the personal and heavenly revelation at the Baptism (Matt. 3 : 14-17, cf. Jn. 1 : 30-34). Naturally, coming as he did in the prophetic line, the Baptist's chief duty lay in his message; and yet the events to which he forelooked stood so near that his message took upon itself the form of an immediate service towards their realization (ver. 2f.), and the One whom his message announced was so great and mighty in relation to him who announced him that the spirit of his service became one of servitude. The Synoptists unite in this idea, though Mark's form of statement—the **latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose** (in which he is followed essentially by Luke)—is perhaps a char-

8. down and unloose. I baptized you ¹ in water; but he shall baptize you ¹ in the Holy Spirit.

(B) *Induction of Jesus into His Work, 1 : 9-13*

9. And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John

¹ with.

acteristically vivid reproduction of the Baptist's words, which we have in their more likely form in Matthew's simpler statement (3 : 11). Both forms, however, present an act of servitude. This spirit of service and servitude is increased by his fuller knowledge of Jesus. We see the service in his transference of disciples to Jesus (Jn. 1 : 35-37), the servitude in his willing recedence before the ministry of Jesus (Jn. 3 : 29f.). It is significant that his final query regarding Jesus came from his failure to understand that self-sacrifice was as fully involved in the Messiah's work as in his own.

8. **Water . . . Holy Spirit:** The correlation of these terms was suggested to the Baptist from such prophetic statements as Isa. 44 : 3 and Ezek. 36 : 25f., which he naturally modified in phraseology, in view of the rite which he performed.

1. *The Baptism of Jesus*

9. **Nazareth of Galilee:** Mark is specific in the naming of the place, as compared with Matthew (3 : 13) who uses the general term, "from Galilee." This is due, doubtless, to his readers being Gentiles, in contrast with the extra-Palestinian Jewish readers of Matthew. Luke, who also wrote for a Gentile ignorance of Palestine, secures his object by not burdening his narrative with any reference to the place at all. It was an insignificant spot, unnamed in the Old Testament, apparently unknown to Josephus, and evidently in the time of Jesus held in slight esteem (Jn. 1 : 46). Its modern name is *En-Nâsira*. It has a present population of about 5000, and though secluded among the foothills of the Lebanon range, is picturesquely located at a height of some 1600 ft., with a beautiful view of the Plain of Esdraelon as far as Carmel. **Was baptized of John in (properly into) the Jordan:** Mark contents himself with a bare statement of the fact, letting the following incident of the opened heavens stand as guaranty that Jesus was not baptized as one of the people for the remission of his sins. Matthew alone gives the purpose Jesus had in mind in submitting to this rite, which was that thus both he and the Baptist should "fulfil all righteousness" (3 : 15). This does not mean that by

10. ¹ in the Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens rent asunder, and the
 11. Spirit as a dove descending upon him: and a voice

¹ with.

going through this form with those whom the Baptist had summoned to prepare themselves for the coming Messianic Kingdom, he would be identifying himself with the cause of Righteousness which this kingdom was to establish in the world, and so contributing to its fulfilment. This would be a technical use of "Righteousness" which would be quite beyond the Baptist's understanding at that time, as it was apparently even later (Matt. 11 : 2ff.), and would be a poor conception of "fulfilling" it. It means rather that in so far as this rite was symbolical of the candidate's moral attitude towards the coming Messianic work Jesus submitted to it as an expression of the moral attitude which he himself was thus willing publicly to assume towards it. The people's attitude came through their repentance and was one of receptivity towards this work in its action upon themselves. Jesus' attitude came through the development of his consciousness of himself with relation to the work he was to do and was one of consecration to its accomplishment. This meaning alone retains "Righteousness" in that Old Testament sense which the Baptist could understand,—*viz.* of living up to the prescribed forms which symbolize relationship between God and man. It was in this sense that the Baptist had instituted this rite, and it was in this sense that by submitting to this rite Jesus fulfilled Righteousness. He lived up to the form that the Baptist had prescribed to express the candidate's moral attitude towards the coming Messianic work. The Baptist realized, doubtless through his examination of him as he presented himself to be baptized (Smith, *In the Days of His Flesh*, p. 31), that it could not express this candidate's repentant preparation for this work, and thus demurred to administer it; but Jesus realized that it would express his consecration to the work and consequently urged its administration as a fulfilling of Righteousness on his part as really as on the part of the people.

10. **The Spirit as a dove descending upon [better into] him:** When we remember the idea of 'moving' ('brooding,' *marg.*) connected with the Spirit in the Creation narrative (Gen. 1 : 2) and the idea of the Messianic endowment with the Spirit (cf. Isa. 11 : 2; 42 : 1; 48 : 16; 61 : 1), it is clear that this descent of the Spirit in the form of a dove was symbolical of this promised endowment of the Messiah for his specific work.

11. **Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased:** Such Old Testament phrases as Ps. 2 : 7; Isa. 42 : 1; 62 : 4, show this

came out of the heavens, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased.

12. And straightway the Spirit driveth him forth into
13. the wilderness. And he was in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan; and he was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him.

divine declaration to have signified the acceptance of Jesus as Messianically endowed.

2. *The Temptation*

12, 13. **The Spirit driveth him forth . . . and he was tempted:** This is the Messianic Spirit with which Jesus had been endowed in his Baptism, the purpose being, in thus leading him into the solitude of the wilderness, to test the consecration of himself to his work which he had publicly announced in this rite. Jesus' growing conviction that he bore a relation to God which no one else around him bore led him to the conviction that there must be a unique mission for him to accomplish for God, since for what other purpose could this unique personal relation exist? Under this conviction did he come to be baptized, as a public consecration of himself to the Messianic work which the Baptist was heralding as near at hand. After the revelation which accompanied his Baptism and assured him of his endowment with the Messianic Spirit, involving, as it did, the supernatural powers of the Messianic age, he would naturally seek seclusion for his own thoughts, which would inevitably bring him into a struggle with the perplexities as to how these powers were to be used. Mark (with Luke) indicates the temptation as an incident in this seclusion, Matthew indicates it as the purpose (4 : 1). **Wilderness:** Probably, a remote and lonelier part of the wilderness of Judæa in which John was baptizing. **Tempted:** The presentation of the conscious choice between good and evil made to appear attractive is perfectly possible to a sinless soul. **Satan:** The Hebrew name for 'Adversary.' All three Synoptists unite in describing the testing as objective to Jesus and not originating in his own soul. **Wild beasts:** Added possibly as a vivid detail of the desolateness of the seclusion; though the presence of wild beasts in the desert regions of Palestine is testified to (Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 240). **Angels:** This reference to angelic ministry is based doubtless on the assurance of Ps. 91 : 11.

II. THE PUBLIC MINISTRY I : 14-7 : 23

1. *The Popular Work in Galilee, I : 14-7 : 23*

14. Now after John was delivered up, Jesus came into
 15. Galilee, preaching the ¹ gospel of God, and saying,
 The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at
 hand: repent ye, and believe in the ¹ gospel.

(A) *The Call of the Four Disciples, I : 16-20*

16. And passing along by the sea of Galilee, he saw
 Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon casting a

¹ good tidings.

14, 15. **After John was delivered up:** In common with the other Synoptists, Mark gives no record of Jesus' gaining of his first disciples at the Jordan, his presence at his first public Passover, and his subsequent Judæan ministry (cf. Jn. chs. 1-3). Further, his record of the Baptist's imprisonment is given later (6 : 17-20), in connection with the record of his death (6 : 21-29). The Fourth Gospel, however, suggests the determining influence of this imprisonment upon the cessation of Jesus' Judæan work and his departure into Galilee. It implies that Jesus left Judæa to avoid a collision with the Jerusalem Pharisees, who had been informed that Jesus' work was promising to be even more successful than the Baptist's, the significance of which is apparent in view of the Baptist's imprisonment, since the forced ending of the Baptist's work would embolden the Pharisees against Jesus (4 : 1-3). **The time is fulfilled:** Jesus' preaching is here given in its taking up of the message of the Baptist, by which alone Jesus could identify himself as the one whom the Baptist had heralded, and in its advance upon that message, by which only he could confirm the Baptist's testimony of the superiority to himself of this Coming One. The identity of his message with the Baptist's is seen in his announcement of the nearness of the kingdom and his call for repentance; his advance upon it, in his call for faith. This summons to repentance, however, had a different accent from that of the Baptist's; since it called for it as a final act in the presence of the kingdom, while the Baptist's called for it simply in preparation for the kingdom's coming. Further, his summons to faith, though it was to faith in the message of the good news ('Gospel,' in its primary sense), involved a personal relationship of confidence in himself as the one delivering the message.

16. **Simon and Andrew:** Simon (the Hellenized form of *Simeon*

17. net in the sea; for they were fishers. And Jesus said unto them, Come ye after me, and I will make you
 18. to become fishers of men. And straightway they
 19. left the nets, and followed him. And going on a little further, he saw ¹ James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, who also were in the boat mending the nets.

¹ *Jacob.*

Gen. 29 : 33), a name doubtless made popular by Simon Macca-bæus, is the only name used of Peter in the Synoptics up to the time of the choosing of the Twelve. The Fourth Gospel records the change to Peter (Aram = *Kēpha*, Cephas) as taking place at his first coming to Jesus (1 : 42). After the choosing of the Twelve, Peter is the common name, though Simon is also used in combination with Peter (Matt. 16 : 16; Mk. 14 : 37), as well as with Bar-Jonah (Matt. 16 : 17), and alone (Matt. 17 : 25; Lk. 22 : 31; 24 : 34). Matthew in our passage hints at the later use (4 : 18). These brothers came from Bethsaida (Jn. 1 : 44), but now resided in Capernaum (Mk. 1 : 21). Their father's name was Jonas (Matt. 16 : 17), or John (Jn. 1 : 42). Tradition gives the mother's name as Joanna. Probably both had been disciples of the Baptist (Jn. 1 : 35, 40f.). For some time, apparently, they had been following Jesus, both in Galilee (Jn. 2 : 2, 11f.) and in Judæa (Jn. 3 : 22; 4 : 2). They had returned with him to Galilee (Jn. 4 : 3, 8; 27-33), but for some reason had apparently gone back to their occupation.

17. **Fishers of men**—a metaphor suggested, not only by their occupation, but especially by the miraculous draught of fishes, which Luke alone records (5 : 4-10). Its significance would be suggested to them further by such Old Testament passages as Jer. 16 : 16 and Amos 4 : 2.

19, 20. **James . . . and John**: James (Hellenized form of *Jacob*, Gen. 25 : 26) and John (Hellenized form of *Johanan*, 1 Chron. 3 : 24, *Jonah*, 2 Kings 14 : 25) were also evidently resident in Capernaum. Their mother is supposed to have been Salome (from the comparison of Mk. 15 : 40 with Matt. 27 : 56). With Peter they formed the circle of the most intimate disciples of Jesus. They were named by Jesus "Boanerges" (Mk. 3 : 17) meaning *Sons of Tumult*, or as explained by Mark, "Sons of Thunder" (see notes on 3 : 16-19). James was the first martyr of the Apostle band (Acts 12 : 2). John outlived the others, completing his work in the Ephesian region of Asia Minor. The fact that their father had hired servants suggests

20. And straightway he called them: and they left their father Zebedee in the boat with the hired servants, and went after him.

(B) *The Opening Day in the Capernaum Ministry,*

I : 21-34 (45)

21. And they go into Capernaum; and straightway on the sabbath day he entered into the synagogue and taught.

that the family possessed some means. **Straightway he called them:** This statement as to the immediacy of the second call leaves room for, if it does not suggest, the draught of fishes as prefatory to the first call. This call of the four fishermen at the Lake presupposes the acquaintance with them at Jordan (Jn. 1 : 35-51). It was a call to a more formal association of themselves with Jesus, which would be significant, in view of such opposition of the religious leaders as had compelled Jesus to abandon his Judæan work. Their immediate response consequently shows a stronger personal attachment to Jesus than we might otherwise suppose existed. The call, as Jesus placed it before them, was to follow out in their mission the principle which he had already followed out in his—the principle of personal contact with and personal impress upon men.

21. **Capernaum**—(properly *Kapharnaum* = *Village of Nahum*), the place which Jesus made the headquarters for his Galilean ministry. It was on the Western side of the North shore of the Lake of Gennesaret, though there is considerable dispute as to its exact site. The discussion lies mainly between *Tell Hâm* and *Khân Minyeh*, with the argument in favor of the former, because of growing evidence that the name was not confined to the city, but was extended to the district surrounding it, which would bring the place into that connection with the Plain of Gennesaret which is implied in the New Testament notices (cf. Jno. 6 : 17 with Mk. 6 : 53) and in the description of Josephus (Jewish Wars III, 10 : 8). In the Gospel times it was a place of considerable importance. It was a customs post (Mk. 2 : 14), the residence of a representative of the king, Herod Antipas (Jn. 4 : 46 *margin*), and a military station, whose commander had built a synagogue for the people (Lk. 7 : 1-10). Mark's mention of the place here lacks the narrative connection in Matthew (4 : 13), which shows that Jesus made it his place of abode upon leaving Nazareth, and particularly in Luke (4 : 31), which makes

22. And they were astonished at his teaching: for he taught them as having authority, and not as the
 23. scribes. And straightway there was in their synagogue
 24. a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out, saying,

his going to Capernaum the sequence of his rejection at Nazareth (but cf. note on 6 : 1-6). **Taught:** The Synagogue being, not so much a place of public worship as of instruction in the Law, teaching was practically the chief feature of its Sabbath service. It was connected with the reading of the Scriptures and was not necessarily conducted by the officials, but was open—as was the reading itself (Lk. 4 : 16)—to any competent Israelite whom they might invite (Acts 13 : 15; cf. Schürer, *Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, II : ii, 75-83). It afforded a favorable opportunity to Jesus for the delivery of his message, which he frequently embraced during his Galilean ministry (cf. Mk. 1 : 39; Jn. 18 : 20).

22. **Astonished:** The instruction usually given consisted largely in the recitation of comments on the text by famous Rabbis. The character of Jesus' instruction may be gathered from the narrative of his address in the Synagogue at Nazareth given by Luke (4 : 16-31). It was a message of his own, directed to the spiritual condition of his hearers and uttered with a conviction due to his consciousness of himself and his mission. It is not surprising that the impression produced upon the people was of one who spoke with a personal authority of which they were never conscious in the usual comments, which were based upon the appeal to the opinion of others.

23. **Immediately**—one of the characteristic words of the Second Gospel and often used, as here and in ver. 21, not so much to denote the exact immediateness of the sequence, as in a vivid way to unify within the incident the several items which constituted it. **Unclean Spirit:** The spirits are almost always designated as "unclean," reference being had to the ceremonially unclean associations of the possessed (e.g. deserted places, Matt. 12 : 43; tombs, Mk. 5 : 2), or to the ceremonially unclean nature of the demons possessing them (e.g. Lk. 4 : 33; cf. Mk. 3 : 22)—a survival of the primitive idea that all demons were unholy and therefore unclean. It was mingled largely with awe, and resulted in a freedom being accorded to the possessed which did not attach to ceremonial uncleanness in general. Luke alone, and in but two passages (7 : 21; 8 : 2) designates them as "evil," possibly, but not necessarily, with reference to immoral tendencies in the possession (cf. Acts 19 : 13-16); though the designation of them in Matt. 12 : 45 and Luke 11 : 26 as "wicked" evidently calls attention to these traits.

24. **The Holy One of God:** It is evident that this term is ascribed

What have we to do with thee, Jesus thou Nazarene? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou
 25. art, the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked ¹ him,
 26. saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And the unclean spirit, ² tearing him and crying with a
 27. loud voice, came out of him. And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What is this? a new teaching! with authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits,

¹ *it*.² *convulsing*.

to Jesus through a sense of hostility and fear on the part of the demon itself (cf. Jas. 2 : 19; Matt. 8 : 29), and not merely as an expression by the man of a consciousness of ceremonial, much less of moral, difference between himself and this Teacher.

25. **Hold thy peace**—strictly, 'Be muzzled' (cf. its literal use in 1 Tim. 5 : 18; 1 Cor. 9 : 9, and its metaphorical use in Mk. 4 : 39). With his consciousness of his own Messiahship and his desire that his disciples should come to know him as such (Mk. 8 : 27-29), Jesus had no wish that they, or the people generally, should be brought to this conviction through such channels as these. The only true conception of his Messiahship was that which came from his personal impress of himself upon their own religious experience. **Come out of him**: Whatever superstitions may have been resident in the popular idea of these afflictions, and whatever elements of natural disease may have been involved in them, this command confronts us with the fact that Jesus recognized them and dealt with them as cases of actual possession (cf. Mk. 5 : 8; 9 : 25).

26. This idea of possession is emphasized by the statement of personal action on the part of the spirit in obedience to the command: **Tearing him and crying out**.

27. **They were all amazed**—a similar impression to that which came from his teaching. It was, however, of a deeper and more profound kind, as would be natural, in view of the act performed. It was awe rather than astonishment (cf. 9 : 15; 10 : 32; 16 : 5f.). And yet in the minds of the people the impression was vitally associated with the personality which had so authoritatively manifested itself in the teaching. This is clear from the disconnected remarks of the excited throng which Mark so vividly reproduces. **What is this? a new (vigorous, forceful as in 2 : 21f., not simply novel, strange) teaching! with authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits and they**

28. and they obey him. And the report of him went out straightway everywhere into all the region of Galilee round about.
29. And straightway, when ¹ they were come out of the synagogue, they came into the house of Simon
30. and Andrew, with ² James and John. Now Simon's wife's mother lay sick of a fever; and straightway
31. they tell him of her: and he came and took her by the hand, and raised her up; and the fever left her, and she ministered into them.
32. And at even, when the sun did set, they brought

¹ Some MSS. read *he . . . he.*

² *Jacob.*

obey him—a procedure imperial in its difference from the magical exorcisms at which the Rabbis labored.

28. **All the region of Galilee round about**—the outlying country about Capernaum, probably a much wider extent of territory than that later covered in Jesus' first preaching tour (see note on 1 : 38f.).

29. **The house of Simon and Andrew:** As Simon was married, the house doubtless belonged to him, while Andrew shared it with him. Whether this became the Capernaum home of Jesus is not certain. This visit after the Synagogue service was evidently the first he had made to the house, and he must have been in the city at least one night previous to the Sabbath. At the same time, Peter's pursuit of Jesus in his early morning departure from the city (ver. 35f.) would seem to indicate that they resided together (cf. Matt. 17 : 24f. against which Matt. 13 : 36; Mk. 9 : 33; 10 : 10 are not relevant).

30, 31. **A fever**—possibly of the malarial type frequent in the marshy plain in which Capernaum was situated, though Luke's description of it as "a great fever" (Galen distinguishes fevers as "great" and "slight") might indicate that it was of a more malignant sort. Even so, it is Luke who emphasizes the immediateness of the recovery (4 : 38f.). **Ministered unto them**—doubtless at the Sabbath meal. This statement, which is made by all the Evangelists, implies the immediateness of the recovery in the fact of its completeness. The lassitude usually present in fever convalescence is absent, and the customary duties of the house are at once resumed.

32, 33. **When the sun did set:** The ending of the Sabbath with the setting of the sun permitted the labor involved in the carrying and, in fact, in the curing of the sick (Lk. 13 : 10-14). **All the city was**

unto him all that were sick, and them that were ¹ possessed with demons. And all the city was gathered together at the door. And he healed many that were sick with divers diseases, and cast out many demons; and he suffered not the demons to speak, because they knew him.²

And in the morning, a great while before day, he rose up and went out, and departed into a desert place, and there prayed. And Simon and they that

¹ *demoniacs.*

² Many MSS. add *to be Christ*, cf. Lk. 4: 41.

gathered at the door: The news not only of the public healing in the synagogue but also of the private cure in the house had spread throughout the city, with the result that all who were diseased or possessed of evil spirits were brought about the narrow door which in Oriental houses opened through the wall that shut off the house itself from the street (cf. 11 : 4).

34. Many: Mark is general in his statement, Matthew comprehensive ("all," 8 : 17), Luke particular ("Every one of them," 4 : 40), the impression from the combined narrative being that to this widely gathered appeal of suffering Jesus responded with an unrestrained largess of his healing gifts.

The First Preaching Tour, 1 : 35-45

35. A great while before day (lit. *very much at night*)—Mark here, as in ver. 32, is most precise in his statement of time, a trait perfectly natural, in view of the personal reminiscence that lies behind his narrative, and is particularly disclosed through the specific reference to Simon in the following verse. **A desert place**—one of the many barren and solitary places in the ravines and on the tops of the ranges just back of Capernaum. **Prayed** (Better, *was praying*, or even *continued in prayer*)—The events of the previous day had confronted him with the immediate purpose of his ministry, which was the heralding to men of the good news of the kingdom. This could not be accomplished by staying in Capernaum and trusting men to come to hear his message; it necessitated his leaving the city and taking his message to men. And for this undertaking—the first mission tour of his ministry—he needed special communion with the Father who had appointed him his ministry and given him its message.

36, 37. Simon and they that were with him—not Simon's house-

37. were with him followed after him; and they found him,
 38. and say unto him, All are seeking thee. And he saith
 unto them, Let us go elsewhere into the next towns,
 that I may preach there also; for to this end came I
 39. forth. And he went into their synagogues through-
 out all Galilee, preaching and casting out demons.

hold, nor necessarily his intimate friends, but simply those of the city who had come early to Simon's house, where the healing ministry of the evening before had taken place, to see and hear again this wonderful teacher and have a fresh experience of his wonderful powers. Jesus' following had not yet had time to crystallize itself into a definite discipleship, which could be referred to by this name. It is clear that the Evangelist got this incident from Peter's own lips. It bears all the marks of the early surroundings of Jesus' work. **Followed after him**—literally, *pursued him, tracked him*. **All are seeking thee:** Their idea of Jesus' ministry was narrower than his own. They conceived of it as measured by men's seeking of Jesus; he, as measured by his seeking of men.

38. **The next towns**—(strictly *village-cities*)—a peculiar word, nowhere else used in the New Testament. Its reference is to the larger villages, which in location were nearer the city centers, and so stood in importance between the isolated hamlets and the cities themselves. Practically equivalent to our term *suburban towns*. (See the catalogue of Josh. 15 : 20-61 for the expression "cities with their villages"; cf. also Josh. 10 : 36-39 LXX). According to Mark, therefore, Jesus' first preaching tour was a restricted one, as far as extent of territory is considered, which agrees with this Evangelist's idea of the development of his whole ministry. **To this end came I forth**—[from Capernaum]—against Luke's transcendental phrase "for therefore was I sent." His immediate purpose had been prayer; his ultimate purpose had been this extension of his ministry. Simon and his companions must not think to take him back to Capernaum, as though he had come out simply for an hour's devotion; they must see the larger plan he had which, however it might centre at Capernaum, moved out over the surrounding region.

39. **Throughout all Galilee:** These words, being clearly inconsistent with Mark's idea of a restricted tour, should be omitted, as an editorial addition, on the basis of Matthew's comprehensive statement (4 : 23). Without them the verse reads most naturally and is in perfect agreement with the rest of the passage. (For the existence of Synagogues in such small communities as would be represented by these suburban towns, see Schürer, II, ii, 73).

40. And there cometh to him a leper, beseeching him,¹ and kneeling down to him, and saying unto him, If
 41. thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And being moved with compassion, he stretched forth his hand, and touched him, and saith unto him, I will; be thou
 42. made clean. And straightway the leprosy departed
 43. from him, and he was made clean. And he² strictly

¹ Some MSS. omit *and kneeling down to him*.

² sternly.

40. **A leper:** The leprosy of the Bible was not treated as a contagious disease, and consequently was different from that which goes under this name in medicine (*elephantiasis Græcorum*). It affected the skin rather than the bones, did not necessarily cripple the sufferer, and was never spoken of as a fatal malady. In fact, when partially covered with the eruptions, the sufferer was ceremonially unclean; when these had spread over his whole body, he was clean (cf. art. Disease and Medicine, *Standard Bible Dictionary*). In either case, however, there is nothing to prevent the incident having occurred in one of the Synagogues mentioned in ver. 39, since provision was made for unclean lepers in the Synagogue, under restrictions which segregated them from the congregation. Doubtless, it took place at the close of the service, or perhaps after the discourse which the Master had delivered—a discourse which we can easily believe was full of good news to all who suffered and were heavy laden (cf. Matt. 11 : 28, and the discourse at Nazareth, Lk. 4 : 16-21, which, however, was largely determined by the lesson for the day). As far as we have record, this was the first case of this disease which had come before the Master. It was not brought to him by others. Distinct as Jesus' popularity was, it did not seem yet to have suggested the possibility of his curing this malady. It was a case of the sufferer's desperate faith for himself.

41, 42. **Moved with compassion**—a statement made here only by Mark and suggesting, not simply sympathetic narrative, but narrative from the viewpoint of a personal eyewitness and close observer—carrying along the personal reminiscence definitely indicated in the previous passage (ver. 36). **Touched him**—not merely the customary symbolic action accompanying cures (5 : 23; 6 : 5; 7 : 33; 8 : 22f.; cf. 2 Kings 4 : 34; 5 : 11), but as expressing Jesus' independence of the Mosaic restrictions in the case of this disease. **Straightway:** The cure resulting was immediate, as all the Evangelists testify.

43. **Strictly charged him** (better, *having spoken to him sternly*).—A striking phrase, peculiar to Mark and representing, not any anger

44. charged him, and straightway sent him out, and saith unto him, See thou say nothing to any man: but go show thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing the things which Moses commanded, for a testimony
 45. unto them. But he went out, and began to publish

on Jesus' part, as though he resented the leper's presence in the place, but simply a strong feeling of urgency accompanying the action by which he **sent him out** and the command in which he enjoined him to **say nothing to any man** (cf. Matt. 9 : 30). It indicates the intense earnestness involved in Jesus' desire that the man should not, by indiscreet proclamation of the cure, arouse among the people a sensational enthusiasm which would hinder the primary work for which he had undertaken the tour—a result which unfortunately actually occurred (ver. 45).

44. **Show thyself to the priests:** This is in no way connected with Jesus' desire to prevent indiscreet action on the part of the cured man, as though by a subterfuge he would secure his absence from the place. From the case of the ten lepers (Lk. 17 : 14) it is clear that the command would have been given whether his absence was desired or not. In fact, this observance of the ceremonial law in connection with the previous disregard of it (ver. 41) is significant; for a study of Jesus' attitude toward the prohibitions and commands of the ceremonial law—especially towards these Rabbinic refinements—discloses the fact that those regulations which symbolized and enforced man's separation from God and from his fellow men Jesus did not hesitate to ignore (cf. Lk. 6 : 2; 7 : 14, 39; Matt. 9 : 11, 14), while those which represented and encouraged his communion with God and his fellowship with his fellow men Jesus was careful to observe (cf. Matt. 3 : 15; Lk. 4 : 16; 10 : 26-28). This is the explanation of Jesus' apparently self-contradictory attitude towards the law of leprosy in this incident. **A testimony unto them:** The showing of himself to the priest and the offering of the prescribed sacrifices would be evidence to them of his cure and of his right to be returned into full fellowship with the people of God. This was the only testimony Jesus wanted him to bear, while, for his own sake, it was the one testimony he needed to bear.

45. **No more openly enter into a city:** While we are not to suppose that this was the only incident that occurred on the tour, and while we are given no information as to whether it occurred soon after Jesus left Capernaum, or later, it is clear that Mark understands its effect was practically to destroy the preaching purpose for which the tour had been undertaken, and so to throng him with a curious crowd

it much, and to spread abroad the ¹ matter, insomuch that ² Jesus could no more openly enter into ³ a city, but was without in desert places: and they came to him from every quarter.

(C) *Return to Capernaum and Work from that Centre,*

2 : 1-7 : 23

2. And when he entered again into Capernaum after
2. some days, it was noised that he was ⁴ in the house.
- And many were gathered together, so that there was no longer room *for them*, no, not even about the door:
3. and he spake the word unto them. And they come,

¹ Grk. word.

² he.

³ the city.

⁴ at home.

that he was not able to appear publicly in the streets of these suburban towns, but was compelled to carry on such ministry as he could in the outlying **desert** [unfrequented] **places**, and even there the miracle-expecting multitude crowded upon him from every neighboring place.

(1) *The Healing of the Paralytic, 2 : 1-12 (13)*

2 : 1, 2. **In the house** (strictly, *at home* or *indoors*) a phrase which would be perfectly fitting, whether the house were his own or Simon's. **No longer room . . . not even about the door:** The tour had so increased the sensational interest in Jesus' miracle powers that his return to Capernaum was marked by an even greater multitude about the door of the house, the populace of the city doubtless being added to by those who had gathered to his following along the way. **Spake the word:** From Mark's record it is clear that, however Jesus' purpose to preach had been interfered with on the tour, it was still being persisted in, in spite of the greater crowds which pressed upon him. That his work, however, was not confined to teaching is evident, not only from Luke's statement (5 : 17), but from the following incident, which was doubtless simply selected from the many acts of healing which he again performed in the city.

3. **Palsy**—general term for paralysis—the loss of muscular power resulting from injury or disease of the brain or nervous system. Specific (trembling) palsy is perhaps referred to in Jer. 23 : 9; spinal meningitis, possibly, in Matt. 8 : 6. **Bringing . . . borne of four:** A group of the man's friends are represented as bringing him to the

- bringing unto him a man sick of the palsy, borne of
4. four. And when they could not ¹ come nigh unto him for the crowd, they uncovered the roof where he was: and when they had broken it up, they let
 5. down the ² bed whereon the sick of the palsy lay. And Jesus seeing their faith saith unto the sick of the
 6. palsy, ³ Son, thy sins are forgiven. But there were certain of the scribes sitting there, and reasoning
 7. in their hearts, Why doth this man thus speak? he blasphemeth: who can forgive sins but one, *even* God?

¹ Many MSS. read *bring him unto him*.

² *pallet*.

³ Grk. *child*.

house, lying on his mattress—a thickly padded quilt—which was borne by four (possibly servants).

4. **Uncovered the roof**—the covering over the rooms which were located around the open court, and access to which was often furnished by stairs on the outside of the house (13 : 15). **Broken it up** (lit. *dug it out*): This covering consisted of large beams, across which were laid smaller rafters and over all brushwood or reeds. These were covered by a thick layer of earth, and this by a covering of plaster or clay and sometimes thin stone slabs (Lk. 5 : 19). **Let down the bed**: The house was most likely, a one story structure, and the Master was speaking in, or just in front of, the principal room, which was across the court, opposite the entrance from the street, and directly under the roof (see Tristram, *Eastern Customs in Bible Lands*, pp. 33-36).

5. **Seeing their faith**—including that of the sufferer himself: It was not a case of vicarious, but of personal faith. In fact, from other incidents of healing it is reasonable to believe that the sufferer's personal interest in his own case and his personal conviction as to Jesus' ability were the inspiration to their action on his behalf (cf. Jn. 5 : 7; Mk. 10 : 46-48). **Thy sins are forgiven**—the sins which, possibly in fact, and certainly in the man's thought, were the cause of his physical condition (cf. Jn. 5 : 14). However unexpected this may have been to the man and his friends as Jesus' way of approach to his case, it was realized by them all as necessarily involved in his healing; since they shared in the common belief that sin and suffering were intimately linked together (cf. Jn. 9 : 2; Lk. 13 : 2).

6, 7. **Reasoning in their hearts**: Jesus' action was as startling to the Scribes as it was unexpected to the paralytic and his friends. The

8. And straightway Jesus, perceiving in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, saith unto them,
 9. Why reason ye these things in your hearts? Which is easier, to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins are forgiven; or to say, Arise, and take up thy ¹ bed, and
 10. walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath authority on earth to forgive sins (he saith to
 11. the sick of the palsy), I say unto thee, Arise, take

¹ *pallet.*

questions which at once rose up within them are vividly reproduced by Mark. There is first the surprised query, **Why doth this man thus speak?** This query is then formulated in a positive expression of opinion: **He blasphemeth.** Finally, there is disclosed the reason by which the opinion was justified in their minds: **Who can forgive sins but one, even God?** The protest was instinctive, represented their actual state of mind, and, from their point of view, was perfectly justified. What they resented was, not Jesus' assumption of the right to pronounce absolution, but his pronouncement of it without apparent ceremonial requirement. Priestly absolution, to which they were accustomed, was always dependent upon the fulfilment of ceremonial conditions. They were quick to realize the essential opposition of Jesus' assumption to the whole cultus which gave them standing among the people. They did not appreciate—if they were aware of the fact—that the real underlying condition of all God's forgiving was the personal trust of the soul in Him.

8, 9. Jesus, consequently, challenges their ceremonial position. **Which is easier to say . . . forgiven, or . . . Arise . . . and walk?** It would seem at first that they might have chosen the former alternative, since it was in a hidden field of action without apparently any visible proof of its effectiveness; but in reality they could make no choice at all, since, believing as they did, all the more because of their ceremonialism, that sin and suffering were vitally connected, either would be equally difficult. Forgiveness would have to prove itself by a resultant cure, and cure would involve a precedent forgiveness.

10, 11. **That ye may know:** The Master does not commit himself to their belief. He simply cures the paralytic and thus places before them an object lesson, the inference from which, in view of their position, it would be impossible for them to ignore. **Son of man**—one of the latent Messianic terms in Jesus' day, derived through Apocalyptic usage from Dan. 7 : 13 and adopted by Jesus, because, being

12. up thy ¹ bed, and go unto thy house. And he arose, and straightway took up the ¹ bed, and went forth before them all; insomuch that they were all amazed, and glorified God, saying, We never saw it on this fashion.
13. And he went forth again by the sea side; and all the multitude resorted unto him, and he taught them.

¹ pallet.

less suggestive to the popular mind of Messianic claims (cf. Jn. 12 : 34, and note that during his ministry this term is never applied by others to Jesus), it enabled him to carry on his work with less interference from the Messianic misconceptions of the people and their political leaders than would have been the case had he referred to himself as "Son of David," or "Son of God." (Notice how, according to Mark's record, these two terms are reserved by Jesus until the close of his ministry, while the term, "Son of Man," is used but twice before the confession of his Messiahship at Cæsarea Philippi.) As used by Jesus, it represents his claim to determine authoritatively the religious life and destiny of man (cf. besides our passage, 2 : 28; Lk. 12 : 8; 19 : 10; 21 : 36; Mk. 13 : 26).

12. **Straightway:** As in the previous cases, the cure is immediate. **All amazed:** According to the Evangelists, the impression produced by this miracle seems to have been peculiarly strong (cf. 5 : 42; 6 : 51), Matthew and Luke adding to Mark's statement the fact that the people were filled with fear, while Matthew states that the reason for their praise of God was that he **had given such authority** [to forgive sins] **unto men**, showing (1) that paralysis was, in the popular experience, a far more serious malady than fever, demonism, or even leprosy; and (2) that the crowd had caught no Messianic claim in the title "Son of man," though from Matthew's statement they seem to have recognized the spiritual point at which the claim had been made. With the Scribes, however, the recognition was clear and unquestioned. They saw intuitively the conflict between the spiritual principle represented in Jesus' action and the ceremonial principle of their own position. These two principles, they, as well as Jesus, realized could never coexist. Conflict between them was inevitable and had to come to issue as soon as the one challenged the other in its claim to determine the people's religious living.

13. **Went forth again:** Mark is the only one who gives a narrative introduction to the call of Matthew, and, while it contains no note of time, it seems most naturally to follow immediately upon the

14. And as he passed by, he saw Levi the *son* of Alphæus sitting at the place of toll, and he saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose and followed him.
15. And it came to pass, that he was sitting at meat in his house, and many publicans and sinners sat down with Jesus and his disciples: for there were many,

cure of the paralytic. This cure had challenged the Scribes with an object lesson which was a sufficient reply to their criticism, without added comment on Jesus' part. The instruction which might have been expected to follow it was thus reserved for the people and given on the open beach by the sea, where the thronging multitude might better be reached by his words. (See an apparently similar occasion, 3 : 7-9.) There **all the multitude resorted unto him, and he taught them.** (Notice how Jesus selects the seaside for his teaching at Capernaum, Lk. 5 : 1-3; Mk. 3 : 7-9; 4 : 1f.).

(2) *The Call of Levi, 2 : 14-22*

14. **Levi**—the Jewish name of Matthew, which was later assumed (or given), as was frequent with the Jews upon entering on a new career (cf. Jn. 1 : 42, and note thus the significance of Rev. 2 : 17), **the son of Alphæus**, not to be identified with Alphæus, the father of James the Less (3 : 18). **At the place of toll**—a customs station on the main caravan route between Syria and Egypt, which passed along the seaside into Capernaum, marking the frontier between the tetrarchy of Herod Philip and that of Herod Antipas; consequently an important station calling for many officials. **Follow me:** This command and its instant response assume not only an acquaintance on Jesus' part with Levi's character, but also an interest in, as well as an acquaintance with, Jesus' teaching on the part of Levi. This easily could have come through the ministry which Jesus had already accomplished in Capernaum; might indeed have resulted from what Levi had seen and heard of Jesus' discourses by the sea; in fact, might have been the fruitage of this single discourse which, because of its background in the paralytic's cure, entered more into the character of Jesus' own mission and challenged to his following those to whom it appealed.

15. **In his house**, *i.e.* Levi's, as would be natural in the case of a newly chosen disciple (cf. Lk. 19 : 1-6), and is confirmed by the definite statement of Luke (5 : 29). **Publicans**—collectors of *public* revenue, a term applicable to receivers of import duties, as well as to gatherers of internal taxes, in the system of taxation carried on under

16. and they followed him. And the scribes ¹ of the Pharisees, when they saw that he was eating with the sinners and publicans, said unto his disciples, ² *How is it that he eateth* ³ and drinketh with publicans

¹ Some MSS. read *and the Pharisees*.

² Some MSS. omit *He eateth*.

³ Some MSS. omit *and drinketh*.

the Procurators of the Roman Provinces; though in Galilee, which was a part of the autonomous tetrarchy of Herod Antipas, the taxation was not administered by the Roman Government, but by Herod himself for his own use. At the same time, Herod, being an appointee of Rome, the system was looked upon by the people as part of the oppressors' rule; while being managed in Galilee, as everywhere, on the farming out principle, it was administered with an extortion (cf. Lk. 3 : 12f.; 19 : 1-10) that made its officials, especially when Jews, genuinely hated by the People and despised by the religious leaders (cf. Matt. 18 : 17). **Sinners**—not social outcasts, as the woman in Lk. 7 : 37, but the religiously unchurched, as in Gal. 2 : 15—most likely here the general class of native officials, who because of their necessary intercourse and life with non-Jews, had come to be counted and to count themselves as no longer belonging to the congregation of Israel, who righteously observed the law. **There were many:** Capernaum being not only an important customs post on the frontier of Herod's territory, but one of the centres of his internal government (see note on 1 : 21), this class of tax gatherers and general officials is likely to have been large. Matthew's purpose in asking them to this feast was that they might become acquainted with his new Master; while Jesus' motive in having social fellowship with them was that he might thus follow up the aggressive steps he had taken against ceremonial Judaism in calling to his discipleship one like Matthew who, not only from the Scribes' point of view was religiously outlawed, but from the people's point of view was outcast from the nation. It was an object lesson for both Scribes and people alike, not so much of the essentially spiritual character of his ministry, as of its essential opposition to the artificial, tyrannical, and hypocritical self-righteous standards which the religious rulers had set up in Judaism. It was, in brief, a bold appeal to the human heart that needed God.

16. **Scribes of the Pharisees**—those who belonged to the strict sect of the Pharisees (cf. Acts 23 : 9), the religious party which stood for the uncompromising separation from everything non-Jewish and for the scrupulous observance of the Law. **Said unto his disciples:** Their opposition had been silent at the healing of the paralytic; it was not yet bold enough to address its criticism directly to the Master.

17. and sinners? And when Jesus heard it, he saith unto them, They that are ¹ whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.
18. And John's disciples and the Pharisees were fasting: and they come and say unto him, Why do John's disciples and the disciples of the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not? And Jesus said unto them, Can the sons of the bridechamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them? as long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast.

¹ *strong.*

Eateth and drinketh: The ground of their criticism was that this denationalized and unchurched class was no class with which a Jewish teacher should have social intercourse.

17. **They that are whole . . . that are sick:** Again the Master takes the point of view of the Scribes. On the basis of their claim to be religiously strong and well, they needed no service from him, but these whom they held to be religiously weak and diseased had need of his ministry; for he had not come to summon to his following the legally **righteous**, but those who were counted legally **sinners**.

18. **Were fasting**—most likely at the time of the asking of the question, which, according to Mark, was put to the Master, not necessarily by the Baptist's disciples (as in Matthew), but by persons (not the Scribes) who knew the facts and were puzzled for an explanation (as in Luke). **Why do John's disciples . . . and . . . of the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not?** The thing difficult to understand was that, though there was a sympathy between the disciples of the Baptist and Jesus, which was wholly lacking between them and the Pharisees (cf. Matt. 3 : 7f.), yet in common with the Pharisees they observed the custom of the semi-weekly fast (cf. Lk. 18 : 12) which Jesus apparently made no attempt to enjoin upon his disciples (cf. Lk. 11 : 1 for what might have been expected as to such enjoining).

19, 20. **Sons of the bridechamber**—the particular friends of the bridegroom, who were responsible for the successful carrying out of the wedding festivities and accompanied the bridegroom to the house of the bride (cf. Jud. 14 : 10f.). The significance of Jesus' reply lies in the fact that it is made in the words that the Baptist

-
20. But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then will they fast in
 21. that day. No man seweth a piece of undressed cloth on an old garment: else that which should fill it up taketh from it, the new from the old, and a worse
 22. rent is made. And no man putteth new wine into old wine-skins; else the wine will burst the skins, and the wine perisheth, and the skins: but *they put* new wine into fresh wine-skins.
-

had already used with reference to him (Jn. 3 : 29f.). Had the meaning of these words been fully appreciated, the questioners would not have been at a loss to understand the freedom of the religious living of Jesus' disciples; for if the Baptist, as the friend of the Bridegroom, could rejoice in the Bridegroom's happiness, even though it meant the disappearance of himself from view, then surely those who stood in closer and more constant companionship with the Bridegroom than did he, could not be mournful and sad as long as the Bridegroom was with them. **The days will come:** When the Bridegroom is taken from them, they will fast; but then their fasting would be an expression of their real sorrow and not a mere ceremonial form. This reference to a coming forceful taking away of the Bridegroom is the first intimation by Jesus, in the Synoptic narrative, of the fate that he foresaw awaited him, a fate which, if not suggested, was easily confirmed in its forecast by the imprisonment of the Baptist which had already taken place (1 : 14).

21, 22. If in their hearts the questioners demurred to this answer of Jesus, as they considered that, while the Baptist rejoiced in the Bridegroom's voice, he did not express his joy by neglect of fasting, it would be only a confession of the necessary narrowness of spirit which belonged to him as a representative of the Old Dispensation. It is this essential difference in the spirit of the two Dispensations that Jesus brings out in these two parabolic sayings about the undressed cloth and the new wine—by which he shows the impossibility of carrying on his work in true accord with all its significant newness of character and still subjecting it to the old forms which belonged to the preparatory work which had gone before. In both sayings Jesus represents the situation as one in which a new thing is placed in old surroundings, with the result that the strength and vitality of the new thing destroys the weakness of the old surrounding and really injures itself and the situation in the attempt. Un-

23. And it came to pass, that he was going on the sabbath day through the grainfields; and his disciples
 24. began, as they went, to pluck the ears. And the Pharisees said unto him, Behold, why do they on the
 25. sabbath day that which is not lawful? And he said

dressed cloth—unbleached cloth, which in its shrinking tears away from that to which it has been sewed. **New wine**—fresh, unfermented wine, whose process of fermentation the old, hard, unelastic, perhaps thin worn and patched up (cf. Josh. 9 : 4) skins would not be able to withstand.

(3) *The Sabbath Journey through the Grain Field, 2 : 23-28*

23. **Grain fields** (lit., *sown fields*)—fields sown with seed which was growing up into crops,—in this case, probably either barley or wheat, which were the principal grain crops of Palestine, both being sown in the late fall and harvested in the spring. As the grain was ripe enough for eating, the harvest was doubtless near at hand. As this generally lasted the seven weeks from Passover to Pentecost, the time of the incident could not have been long before Passover, was more probably after it. **Began, as they went, to pluck** (lit., *Began to make their way plucking*)—a phrase of possible Latin origin, used here loosely to give the idea, not of breaking through the standing grain by beating down the stalks, which was evidently not the thing for which they were criticized, but of progress through the fields while the plucking was going on.

24. **Not lawful**: The point of the criticism was not the fact of plucking (and eating—Matthew and Luke) the grain which belonged to others; since this was expressly allowed, provided no reaping instrument was used, which would make the gathering a matter of profit and not simply of satisfying personal hunger (Deut. 23 : 25). What was criticized was the plucking on the Sabbath. The law forbade all work on the Sabbath (Ex. 20 : 8-11; 35 : 2)—expressly all Sabbath work in time of planting and reaping (Ex. 34 : 21); but it did not enter into the details of what constituted such work. This the Rabbis did, however, holding that plucking was equivalent to reaping, since the hand took the place of the sickle, while the rubbing to which Luke refers (6 : 1) and which naturally must have preceded the eating, involved the hand as a threshing machine. The Rabbinic refinements of the ceremonial law are thus assumed as equally binding with the ceremonial law itself.

25, 26. **What David did**: The reference is to 1 Sam. 21 : 1-7, which relates how David in his flight from Saul came to Nob and

- unto them, Did ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was hungry, he, and they that
 26. were with him? How he entered into the house of God ¹ when Abiathar was high priest, and ate the show-bread, which it is not lawful to eat save for the priests, and gave also to them that were with him?
 27. And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for

¹ Some MSS. read *in the days of Abiathar the high priest.*

demanded the hallowed bread from the priest for himself and his companions. The point of Jesus' reply is that, admitting in general the binding character of the ceremonial law (the Rabbinic refinements are wholly ignored), its obligation had been set aside at times of need in their own sacred history, the inference being that if David could not be blamed for what he had done, neither could his disciples; for the same need was present in both cases. **Abiathar**—an error for Ahimelech, possibly influenced by the near relationship of the two, regarding which, however, there appears to be confusion in the Old Testament itself (cf. 1 Sam. 22 : 20; 11 Sam. 8 : 17; 1 Chron. 18 : 16). Matthew adds another argument from the custom of the priests in the Temple to work on the Sabbath in the prosecution of their sacred duties, the inference being drawn by Jesus that if association with the Temple allowed the priests to set aside the law, his disciples were equally privileged through their association with him, who was superior to the Temple (Matt. 12 : 5-7).

27, 28. **The Sabbath was made for man**—a gnomic statement—a form used by Jesus on more than one occasion (cf. Matt. 6 : 21; 12 : 28, 45; 15 : 11). It announces the principle that the Sabbath was not an eternal law of God in subservience to which man was created, but a divine ordinance instituted with special reference to serving man in his religious life. It followed, therefore, not only that man was to be master over the day and not slave to it, but that he who was **Son of man** had a special lordship over its regulation and use by man.

This shows that Jesus understood his title to involve a representative relationship to man, not merely in the sense of being man's servant, but in the sense of being the director and arbiter in man's religious living. Jesus thus meets the Pharisees' criticism of his disciples, not only with a clear justification of their action, but with a new claim for himself and his relation to man in his religious living.

The situation is a distinct advance upon that at the healing of the Paralytic (2 : 1-12). There the natural resentment at Jesus' claim to

28. man, and not man for the sabbath: so that the Son of man is lord even of the sabbath.

3. And he entered again into the synagogue; and there
 2. was a man there who had his hand withered. And they watched him, whether he would heal him on the
 3. sabbath day; that they might accuse him. And he

forgive sin is answered by a single puzzling question, which took the Pharisees at their own point of view, following it up with a plain object lesson which practically closed the door to further discussion. Here the purely ceremonial criticism is met with a presentation of the deep underlying principles involved, followed with an announcement of personal claims that constituted a new revelation of his relation to the religious life of man. It is a significant fact that Jesus had not just now begun this liberal custom of Sabbath observance. This had been his position from the first (cf. 1 : 21-31). Whatever the Scribes and Pharisees may have thought and said about it, they had been confronted with it all the time. He had not adopted this liberalism, in order to force an issue with his enemies; rather his enemies, aroused by the growing popularity of his ministry, had adopted this criticism, in order to force an issue with him. Jesus was not conducting a campaign; he was living a life, delivering a message, accomplishing a work, self-consistent in its principles from the start (see note on 1 : 44).

(4) *The Sabbath Healing of the Man with the Withered Hand* 3 : 1-5

3 : 1. **Entered again into a Synagogue:** Mark (with Lk. 6 : 6 and in contrast to Matt. 12 : 9) gives no definite statement of time for this event. **Withered hand** (Lk. 6 : 6, *right hand*)—an atrophy of the muscles, not only of the hand itself, but also of the lower arm (cf. ver. 5), resulting in their shrinking and due probably to injury or disease of the nerves controlling them. Similar cases are referred to in Jn. 5 : 3. Most likely the impotent man of ver. 7 suffered from this affliction. The case of Acts 3 : 2 was probably one of congenital defect. (See story of Jeroboam, 1 Kings 13 : 4-6.)

2. **Watched him . . . accuse him**—showing a distinct development of hostility. It is not now simply a resentment against his claims of religious authority, nor even a desire to force an issue with him in the matter of ceremonial observance, but a definite purpose to secure evidence which they might use against him before the Sanhedrin. The Rabbis permitted healing on the Sabbath only when life was in danger. Should he go beyond this limitation, they would charge him as having, in this transgression of the Sabbath law, assailed an essential institution of their religion.

- saith unto the man that had his hand withered, ¹ Stand
 4. forth. And he saith unto them, Is it lawful on the
 sabbath day to do good, or to do harm? to save a
 5. life, or to kill? But they held their peace. And when
 he had looked round about on them with anger, being
 grieved at the hardening of their heart, he saith unto
 the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And he stretched

¹ Grk. *arise into the midst.*

3, 4. **Stand forth**—doubtless in the open space in front of the reader's desk. The man was evidently well up towards the front of the Congregation, either through his natural desire to be where he could attract Jesus' attention, or possibly even through malicious arrangement by the Pharisees, to be where he would catch Jesus' eye. The Pharisees themselves were in the "chief seats," which they loved (cf. Matt. 23 : 6; also Lk. 14 : 7). **To do good, or to do harm:** The latter is not simply the negative of the former, but the positive of its opposite and always in the New Testament implies an evil moral spirit behind it (cf. 1 Pet. 3 : 17; 3 Jn. ver. 11). This alternative leads up to the stronger one, **to save a life, or to kill?** which possibly looks forward to their final action (ver. 6). Instead of debating with the Pharisees the question of Sabbath healing in itself, which would have been fruitless, he lifts the question up to the level of principle, and on that level puts to them this question, which it was impossible for them to answer save in one way, and that way condemned their own position. Jesus thus brought clearly to light the issue between himself and his accusers: Was his doing good, his healing on the Sabbath, a justification for their taking counsel against his own life, as in reality they were intending to do? Naturally, **they held their peace**, being convicted of their utterly unreasonable position and yet being stubbornly unwilling to admit its wrongness. Matthew adds an illustration (12 : 4f.) which he has probably inserted from another similar scene (cf. Lk. 13 : 14f., 14 : 3-5).

5. **Looked round about . . . with anger:** Mark alone gives this graphic description of the scene, adding to it the reason for the feelings: **being grieved at the hardening of their heart**—showing that, however from a formal point of view Jesus' condemnation of the Pharisees may have been directed against their ceremonialism, from the personal point of view it was directed against the stubborn set of their will, which recognized the truth, but would not act upon it. This throws light upon the direction of his constant appeal in the case of his disciples. It was to the will as involved in their personal attitude of

6. it forth; and his hand was restored. And the Pharisees went out, and straightway with the Herodians took counsel against him, how they might destroy him.
7. And Jesus with his disciples withdrew to the sea: and a great multitude from Galilee followed; and from

faith in him. As a consequence, he accepted those who exercised that will, though unaccompanied with emotion (*e.g.* Matthew), or intellectual equipment (*e.g.* the Woman who touched his garment). Emotion and knowledge could develop and grow; the deciding element lay in the initial act of the will. **Stretch forth thy hand:** In view of the desire to accuse Jesus of an unlawful work of healing on the Sabbath, the conspicuous absence of all external means towards the cure is significant. **Stretched it forth . . . restored:** The instant response of the will resulted in an instant cure.

(5) *Connecting Narrative of Incidents, 3 : 6-12*

6. **Herodians**—the political adherents and supporters of the Herod dynasty, having as their aim the restoration of the monarchy under the pagan-Jewish rule of the Herods. They favored thus the fusion of Judaism and Hellenism, which was the ideal of Herod the Great and the stated policy of his sons and, as far as religious opinions were concerned, sympathized with the worldliness of the Sadducees rather than with the legalism of the Pharisees. They are mentioned again in the final week of Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem, when, in combination with the Pharisees, they are sent by the Sadducees to attempt to entangle Jesus in his talk (Mk. 12 : 13), and are referred to indirectly in the advice given by Jesus to his disciples towards the close of his North Galilean work (Mk. 8 : 15). **Counsel . . . destroy him:** Although the Herodians were specially attached to Herod Antipas and had their home in Galilee rather than in Judæa, the development of the Pharisaic hostility towards Jesus to the degree of plotting against his life belongs so distinctively to the close of his ministry that it seems more than probable that this healing of the Withered Hand is a later event brought forward by Mark to group it with the only other incident of controversy over Sabbath observance which his Gospel contains.

Connecting Narrative, Disclosing Jesus' Popularity, 3 : 7-12

7, 8. **Withdrew to the sea**—in order to escape the pressure of the crowds in the city (cf. 2 : 13; 4 : 1f.). Matthew connects it definitely with Jesus' knowledge of this plot; but such a plot, even if planned at

8. Judæa, and from Jerusalem, and from Idumæa, and beyond the Jordan, and about Tyre and Sidon, a great multitude, hearing ¹ what great things he did, came
9. unto him. And he spake to his disciples, that a little boat should wait on him because of the crowd, lest they
10. should throng him: for he had healed many; insomuch that as many as had plagues pressed upon him that
11. they might touch him. And the unclean spirits, whensoever they beheld him, fell down before him, and
12. cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God. And he charged them much that they should not make him known.
13. And he goeth up into the mountain, and calleth unto

¹ *All the things that he did.*

this time, was not likely to be executed immediately, and not likely to be avoided by such a temporary expedient. **A great multitude from Judæa . . . Jerusalem . . . Idumæa . . . beyond the Jordan . . . about Tyre and Sidon . . . hearing what great things he did:** The geographical region from which the crowds were gathered was extensive, but the attraction which drew them was evidently nothing beyond the report of his wonderful works of healing (cf. vs. 10-12).

9. **A little boat . . . lest they should throng him**—as he had done at the calling of the first disciples (Lk. 5 : 3), and later, at the delivering of the parables (Mk. 4 : 1); though in the present case he does not seem to have used it, because of his constant occupation with the cases of healing on the beach.

10-12. **Plagues** (lit. *whips, scourges*)—distressing bodily diseases, involving the idea, not only of acute suffering, but of divine chastisement (Ps. 89 : 32). **Pressed upon him** (lit. *fell upon him*)—showing their intense eagerness to be healed, as is further indicated by their conviction that the cure would result if only they **might touch him** (cf. 5 : 27ff.; 6 : 56; 8 : 22; Acts 5 : 15; 19 : 11f.). **Whensoever**, (or, *as soon as*) . . . **fell down before him**, in fearsome dread, rather than worshipful homage (see note on 1 : 24). **Charged them . . . should not make him known**—not to restrict the further spread of his popularity, but rather to avoid a conviction of his Messiahship on the people's part through such channels (see note on 1 : 25).

him whom he himself would; and they went unto him.
 14. And he appointed twelve,¹ that they might be with
 15. him, and that he might send them forth to preach,
 16. and to have authority to cast out demons:² and Simon
 17. he surnamed Peter; and ³ James the *son* of Zebedee,
 and John the brother of ³ James; and them he sur-
 18. named Boanerges, which is, Sons of thunder: and An-
 drew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew,
 and Thomas, and ³ James, the *son* of Alphæus, and

¹ Some MSS. add *whom also he named apostles*.

² Some MSS. insert and read *and he appointed twelve (and he gave a name to Simon) Peter and James, etc.*

³ *Jacob.*

(6) *The Choice of the Twelve, 3 : 13-19 (21)*

13. **The mountain**—the mountain near at hand (cf. 5 : 11; 6 : 46, as the sea by Capernaum, 2 : 13; 3 : 7), that is, the hills back from the Lake (cf. 5 : 5; 13 : 14; also Gen. 19 : 17; Jud. 1 : 19). Specific mountains are designated by distinguishing terms (cf. 9 : 2; 11 : 1). Luke gives the purpose of this withdrawal as prayer, but represents the prayer, which continued through the night, as preliminary to the choice of the Twelve (6 : 12f.). **Whom he himself would:** The emphatic introduction of the pronoun makes clear Jesus' personal choice in the calling: while the usage elsewhere of the verb *calleth* would seem to indicate that Jesus always directed it, when not to the disciples themselves, at least to the sympathetic portion of the crowd (cf. 3 : 23; 7 : 14; 8 : 34).

14, 15. **Appointed twelve:** This represents a further choice within the larger circle which had been summoned from the general crowd to a stated following of him. The number was doubtless determined because of the representative position they were to hold within the new Israel (cf. Matt. 19 : 28; Lk. 22 : 30; Rev. 21 : 12, 14). The immediate purpose of their call, however, is given in the following statement: They were to be in personal association **with him**, and were to be sent forth by him to **herald** the good news (cf. 1 : 15). Within themselves they were to be qualified for such a mission through this close companionship with him, and before the people by their **authority to cast out demons** (Matt. 10 : 1 adds "to heal all manner of disease and all manner of sickness").

16-19a. **Peter . . . Boanerges:** The name actually given to Simon was the Aramaic *Kepha*, *rock* (Jn. 1 : 42), of which 'Peter' is the Greek equivalent. It does not describe his personal characteristics, which

19. Thaddæus and Simon the ¹ Cananæan, and Judas Iscariot, who also ² betrayed him.

¹ Zealot cf. Lk. 6 : 15; Acts 1 : 13.

² delivered him up.

often showed themselves to be strikingly the opposite (cf. 8 : 29, 32f.; 14 : 26-31), but rather his leadership among the Twelve (cf. 8 : 29; 14 : 37; Matt. 17 : 24), which came into special recognition after the Ascension (cf. Acts 1 : 15; 2 : 14; 3 : 1-4, 12; 4 : 8; 5 : 3, 9, 29, etc.). The Aramaic name given to the Sons of Zebedee was most likely one which meant "sons of thunder," though the etymology is uncertain. If so, it may have been descriptive of the fiery zeal of these two disciples, which showed itself in such incidents as Lk. 9 : 54 and Mk. 9 : 38, or it may have been simply an application of the folklore name connected with the cult of the Dioscuri, because they were twins, or so alike in character and action as appropriately to be spoken of as such. Possibly, both reasons may have been more or less present (see Rendel Harris, *Boanerges*, 1913, Ch. II). Like 'Peter,' it was not necessarily given at this time, but unlike 'Peter' (and the later 'Barnabas,' Acts 4 : 36), it apparently did not persist in use. **Andrew** is separated from his brother Simon, in order to allow the three who were specially intimate with Jesus to be named first (both Matt. 10 : 2 and Lk. 6 : 14 place him next to Peter), but is followed by **Philip**, who was of his city, Bethsaida (Jn. 1 : 44) and is later referred to as in distinct companionship with him (Jn. 12 : 21f., cf. also 6 : 5-9). **Bartholomew** is probably identical with Nathaniel of Cana in Galilee (Jn. 21 : 2). If so, he was brought to Jesus by Philip (Jn. 1 : 45f.) whom he thus properly follows in the list. **Matthew and Thomas** are associated in all the synoptic lists (Acts 1 : 13 separates them by Bartholomew). Matthew is not referred to as the other name for Levi, possibly because it was already his name before coming into the disciple circle (cf. 2 : 14 with Matt. 9 : 9). In Jn. 11 : 16; 20 : 24; 21 : 2, Thomas is given the surname Didymus, *twin*. **James the son of Alphæus**—possibly, a brother of Matthew (cf. 2 : 14). **Thaddæus**: Luke gives his name as Judas the son of James, to distinguish him from Judas Iscariot (6 : 16; cf. also Acts 1 : 13). Under this name he is probably the one referred to in Jn. 14 : 22. **The Cananæan**—an Aramaic word, not designating the city to which he belonged (Cana), but his personal character—*jealous* or *zealous* [*for righteousness*] (cf. Ex. 20 : 5; Deut. 4 : 24). Its Greek equivalent ("the Zealot") is given by Luke (6 : 15). **Judas Iscariot** (lit. *the man of Kerieth*): The location of this place is uncertain. If referred to in Josh. 15 : 25, it was in Southeastern Judah; if in Jer. 48 : 24, 41, it was in Moab, east of the Dead Sea.

19b-21. **Cometh into a house** (lit. *cometh home*)—marking his

20. And he cometh into a house. And the multitude cometh together again, so that they could
 21. not so much as eat bread. And when his friends heard it, they went out to lay hold on him: for
 22. they said, He is beside himself. And the scribes that came down from Jerusalem said, He hath Beelzebub, and, ¹ By the prince of the demons casteth he out the

¹ *in the prince.*

return to Capernaum after his second preaching tour, which included such incidents as the raising of the widow's son (Lk. 7 : 11-17), the anointing of Jesus in the house of a Pharisee (Lk. 7 : 36-50)—possibly the coming to him of the embassy from the Baptist (Lk. 7 : 18-35; Matt. 11 : 2-30). This return from a successful tour would account for the renewed enthusiasm of the populace, which expressed itself not merely in a continuous demand on his time, but in the presentation to him of a desperate case of demonic possession (Matt. 12 : 22). The selection of the case by the people suggests that much of his healing activity during this tour may have been devoted to this prevalent malady. If so, it may account for the idea with which **his friends** (lit. *his family*) set out from Nazareth to **lay hold on him** and bring him home (cf. vs. 31-35 for the conclusion of this expedition), believing that he was **beside himself**. In any case, their effort was due to their general misunderstanding of the spirit of his ministry.

(7) *The Beelzebub Charge and Jesus' Answering Discourse, 3 : 22-30*

22. **He hath Beelzebub:** The reason for the recklessness of such a charge did not lie so much in the extraordinary character of the cure which Jesus had effected, as in the threatening fact that it had led the people to acclaim him as the Messiah (Matt. 12 : 23). The Scribes—especially those from Jerusalem—could not help but see that if this new teacher, the spiritual claims of whose ministry were so opposed to their ceremonial assumptions (see note on 2 : 6f.) should be acknowledged by the people as Messiah, their own religious leadership of the people was doomed. To counteract the effect of this cure, therefore, they claimed that it was accomplished, not by divine but by Satanic power. The name of the **prince of the demons** should be Beelzebub (lit. *the Lord of the Dwelling*, i.e. the inhabited world). The proper reading of this name discloses the significance of the illustrations with which Jesus confirmed his assertion of the impossibility of the charge: not only the divided kingdom, but the divided house

23. demons. And he called them unto him, and said unto
 24. them in parables, How can Satan cast out Satan? And
 if a kingdom be divided against itself, that kingdom
 25. cannot stand. And if a house be divided against itself,
 26. that house will not be able to stand. And if Satan hath
 risen up against himself, and is divided, he cannot
 27. stand, but hath an end. But no one can enter into the
 house of the strong *man*, and spoil his goods, except he
 first bind the strong *man*; and then he will spoil his
 28. house. Verily I say unto you, All their sins shall be
 forgiven unto the sons of men, and their blasphemies
 29. wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: but whosoever
 shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never for-

and the house of the strong man. This is brought out clearly in Jesus' address upon the sending out of the Twelve. "If they have called the *master of the house* Beelzebub how much more them of his household" (Matt. 10 : 25).

23-27. **How can Satan cast out Satan?** The reference is to moral rather than to physical impossibility (cf. Matt. 12 : 34; Lk. 6 : 42; Jn. 5 : 44; 9 : 16). The two illustrations which follow are coordinate and are to be read, "As well is it true that if a kingdom be divided against itself, it cannot stand, as also is it true that if a house be divided against itself, it cannot stand," the statement of ver. 26 coming as a conclusion, "And so it follows that if Satan hath risen up against himself, and is divided, he cannot stand." This presentation of the moral absurdity of the charge is followed by an assertion of its physical impossibility (ver. 27). The thought is that, far from his being in league with Satan, on the contrary, it was impossible for him to have entered Satan's domain and spoiled his possessions—as he had done in these miracles—unless he had first, as his enemy, overcome him. The reference here is not to some previous event in Jesus' ministry in which he had overcome Satan (*e.g.* in the Temptation, for the assaults of Satan continued after that event; cf. Matt. 16 : 23), but to his innate mastership over the forces of evil (cf. 1 Jn. 3 : 8).

28, 29. This warning is added, because Jesus' desire was not simply to expose the logic involved in the Pharisees' charge, but to uncover the personal attitude toward God involved in it. This attitude he holds to be unforgivable, because it involves a contempt of the

30. givenness, but is guilty of an eternal sin: because they said, He hath an unclean spirit.

31. And there come his mother and his brethren; and, standing without, they sent unto him, calling him.

32. And a multitude was sitting about him; and they say unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren with-

33. out seek for thee. And he answereth them, and saith,

Holy Spirit, as the gracious power with which, as in such miracles as this which had been performed, he would draw men to himself (cf. 2 Cor. 6 : 1; Jn. 5 : 40).

(8) *The Visit of Jesus' Mother and Brethren, 3 : 31-35*

31, 32. This incident not only gives us the conclusion of the expedition referred to in ver. 21, but is really a part of the general incident recorded in the preceding verses: since the only intervening material is the discourse of Jesus (Matt. 12 : 38-45), prompted by the hypocritical request of the Scribes and Pharisees for a genuine sign, in order further to depreciate the sign already given in the healing of the Demoniac and so to offset its influence with the people (cf. Luke's insertion of ver. 16 in the narrative of the healing). The crowd is still present, though it is evident from their close gathering around Jesus, as well as from the gracious words which he addressed to them (ver. 34), that it lacked the hostile element which had been represented by the Scribes and Pharisees. Doubtless, the judicial rebuke of Jesus' discourse had caused this element to withdraw, and those whom he had called to hear his answer to the Beelzebul charge (ver. 23) had drawn closer around him, in full sympathy with him. If so, we see here the beginning of that sifting process among the followers of Jesus which increasingly developed and which was the cause of Jesus' introduction into his teaching, in the next succeeding passage, of the parabolic form of discourse. (For other instances of this change in the character of the crowd and Jesus' fuller disclosure of truth to the friendly element remaining, see 7 : 1-17; 9 : 14-28; 12 : 12-37. These make all the more significant the change in the opposite direction during Passion Week; cf. 11 : 18; 12 : 37 with 15 : 8, 11, 13f.). **Calling him:** The bluntness of this phrase suggests the suspicion which had taken hold of his family that he was beside himself (ver. 21) and had to be abruptly dealt with.

33-35. **Whoever shall do the will of God . . . my brother, and sister, and mother:** What Jesus means is simply that the thing which constitutes the closest relation to him is obedience to the will

34. Who is my mother and my brethren? And looking round on them that sat round about him, he saith,
35. Behold, my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.
4. And again he began to teach by the sea side. And there is gathered unto him a very great multitude, so that he entered into a boat, and sat in the sea; and all
2. the multitude were by the sea on the land. And he taught them many things in parables, and said unto

of God, for this was the expression which he himself gave to his own Divine Sonship (cf. Matt. 26 : 39, 42; Jn. 4 : 34; 5 : 30; 6 : 38). This doing of God's will by his disciples will, consequently, be evidence that they have a similar relation to God and thus are more closely bound to himself than any mere family ties could bind them (cf. Matt. 7 : 21). In saying this, he does not annul all family relationship (cf. 7 : 10-13; 10 : 7-9); he only shows that it is not the controlling relationship in life (cf. Matt. 8 : 21f.); so that when the spiritual and family relationships should come into conflict, as he saw they would, it was the former which should be primary and the latter secondary (cf. Matt. 10 : 34-39; Lk. 14 : 25f.). This effort on the part of his family to get possession of him and bring him home, while it was motived by their desire to take care of him and protect him from himself, was, in reality, such an interference with the aim and purpose of his ministry as to compel him to face the issue between these two relationships and maintain the former. This he does, however, not by denouncing the latter, but only by quietly ignoring it. The answer is not given to the family, even indirectly, but to the sympathetic crowd.

(9) *The Day of Parables, 4 : 1-34 (41)*

4 : 1, 2. **Again . . . to teach by the seaside:** This has in mind the former occasions of similar teaching narrated in 2 : 13 and 3 : 7, and most naturally locates this teaching at the same place where they occurred—the beach at Capernaum. According to Matthew, it followed directly upon the preceding incident and at Capernaum (Matt. 13 : 1). Luke inverts the order of the incidents, but says nothing to indicate that it did not occur at Capernaum (8 : 4). **Taught them many things in parables:** This was a new form of dis-

3. them in his teaching, Hearken: Behold, the sower went
4. forth to sow: and it came to pass, as he sowed, some
seed fell by the way side, and the birds came and de-
5. voured it. And other fell on the rocky ground, where
it had not much earth; and straightway it sprang
6. up, because it had no deepness of earth: and when
the sun was risen, it was scorched; and because it had
7. no root, it withered away. And other fell among
the thorns, and the thorns grew up, and choked it,

course, which called attention to familiar processes in nature and common experiences in life, as illustrative of the spiritual truths he wished to make plain to them and bring to their acceptance. It was a form customary in the Rabbinic Schools, but only with more advanced scholars. Jesus used it here with the uneducated people, introducing it because of the sifting process which was taking place in the crowds (see note on 3: 31 f.) and which it was intended to accentuate (see note on vs. 10-12, following). This opening statement indicates that the four parables which follow are given merely as representatives of the day's teaching, which is confirmed by the larger number preserved in the record of Matthew, though some of these latter may have been delivered on other occasions.

3, 4. **The sower**—the particular one of the parable, considered as representative of the class (cf. Jn. 3 : 10, where in the same way Nicodemus is referred to as "the teacher of Israel"). Grain fields may have been visible back from the shore, but the people were facing the sea and the occupation was too familiar to need to have the process carried on before the eye, in order to make its lessons plain. **By the wayside**—by the side of [on the edge of] the foot-path which frequently skirted and sometimes divided the grain fields (cf. 2 : 23). **Devoured it:** Being hard ground, the seed did not fall into the ground and perform its proper function, but lay exposed and was picked up by the birds.

5, 6. **Rocky ground**—not rock strewn ground, but ground where the underlying rock was but thinly covered with earth. In this thin soil the seed received an abundance of passing moisture and therefore sprang up quickly, but because such soil was unable to hold the moisture or allow the seed to strike its roots into deeper earth where the moisture was retained, the growth as quickly withered under the heat of the sun.

7. **Among the thorns** (lit. *into the thorns*)—i.e. into the ground

8. and it yielded no fruit. And others fell into the good ground, and yielded fruit, growing up and increasing; and brought forth, thirtyfold, and sixtyfold, and a
 9. hundredfold. And he said, Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.
 10. And when he was alone, they that were about him

which held the seeds and roots of the thorns. Thorns are to the Eastern cultivated fields what weeds are to ours, and for a part of the year constitute practically the only form of vegetation. Having quicker and more luxuriant growth, they would easily choke out the life of the grain.

8. **Good ground** (lit. *good, as appearing to the eye*)—*i.e.* free from the faults evident in the other ground. **Thirty . . . sixty . . . a hundred fold**—not extravagant, when one considers the fertility of Palestinian soil, though intended to express, in Oriental fashion, the large increase, rather than to measure the actual yield (cf. Gen. 26 : 2).

9. **Let him hear**—a challenge, as frequently given by Jesus (cf. ver. 23; Matt. 11 : 15; 13 : 43; Lk. 14 : 35) to consider carefully the meaning of what had been said, disclosing the purpose with which he had chosen this form of discourse (see note on vs. 10-12, following).

10-12. The effect of the teaching was in accord with its purpose; for **they that were about him**, as well as **the twelve**, came to ask of him the lesson which he had called upon them to discover. In a certain way, that lesson was obvious; but Jesus was anxious, not merely that they should find it, but that they should be drawn to him in its finding. This was what happened. Not only the twelve, but the sympathetic portion of the crowd (Matthew = "the disciples") found him after the public teaching was finished and asked of him his own interpretation of the parables. This, however, involved in a preliminary way making clear to them why he had spoken in parables at all; for only so would they appreciate his interpretation of them and be further encouraged, when he so taught again, to give his parables the attention they merited. (Matthew transfers this idea to the question which they asked, 13 : 10.) **The mystery of the kingdom of God**—the kingdom's secret truth, not in the sense of something unintelligible, but of something hidden, in other words the revelation contained in Jesus' message of the kingdom of God (cf. Eph. 3 : 3-6; 6 : 19). This secret was **given** to them, *i.e.* was placed in their possession, through their receptivity to Jesus' teaching. The understanding of this secret would be aided by this same receptivity, just as by this receptivity they would be drawn to Jesus

11. with the twelve asked of him the parables. And he said unto them, Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without,
12. all things are done in parables: that seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest haply they should turn again,

to satisfy such understanding of it as they had (Matthew thus carries Mark's statement into its further development: "Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom," 13 : 11). **Without—***i.e.* without this receptive circle (Luke renders it "to the rest") **Done in parables:** To the unreceptive portion of the multitude the truth comes to them in parables and nothing more. To them the parables are not suggestive of any lesson and so they are not drawn to the Master for any interpretation of them. It is in this sense that we are to understand the motive with which he made use of the parable form of teaching—it was primarily in order that through their spiritual receptivity his sympathetic followers might be led to deeper understandings of the truth, the result which issued with the unsympathetic and unreceptive multitude being involved in the motive, but in a secondary way. In both cases, the results were determined by the character of those affected. In so far, therefore, as the reason for this method of teaching was concerned, while the results as well as the causes were in view by Jesus, yet that which determined the introduction of the parables was the attitude of mind which the disciples on the one hand and the people on the other had already taken towards the truth (cf. Matt. 13 : 13). **That seeing, they may see and not perceive:** In this phrase Mark places the emphasis upon the secondary results which issued with the unsympathetic multitude, and to the extent of making them the real motive in the case. Evidently, in this statement Mark has been influenced by the explanation given in the early church to the puzzling fact that Jesus' message and mission were rejected by the people of God to whom they were first directed. This church was predominantly Jewish, and it could not understand how God's people came to do so unnatural a thing, unless it was due to the direct hardening of the Jewish heart, in order that the plan God had for His kingdom's progress into the Gentile world should be carried out (cf. Acts 2 : 23; 4 : 28; Rom. 11 : 7f., 25; 1 Pet. 2 : 8.). Under such convictions as to the reason for the Jewish unbelief, their conception of the reason Jesus had in using the parable form of instruction would naturally lay its emphasis on the results which this form produced in the hearts of the Jews who were not moved by them, rather than on the cause

13. and it should be forgiven them. And he saith unto them, Know ye not this parable? and how shall ye
 14. know all the parables? The sower soweth the word.
 15. And these are they by the way side, where the word is sown; and when they have heard, straightway cometh Satan, and taketh away the word which hath
 16. been sown in them. And these in like manner are they that are sown upon the rocky *places*, who, when they have heard the word, straightway receive it

in their unreceptive hearts for its employment. And they would seek to explain these results, as they did the results of unbelief toward Jesus' religion on the part of Judaism in general, as due to the divine hardening of their hearts. It was really the only way, as Jews, they saw how to explain it. It was what Scripture told them had happened in Pharaoh's case; why not in the case of these strangely unmoved countrymen of theirs? In other words, we have here, as in the case of the content of the Baptist's message (1:4), a recasting of the teaching as the Apostolic preaching viewed it. Note the phrase with which Mark closes his statement ("lest haply they should turn again and it should be forgiven them," ver. 12) as reproducing the particularly Jewish preaching of the Apostolic Church (Acts 8:22; Jas. 5:15; 1 Jn. 1:9; 2:12; but not by Paul, save in the Old Testament citation of Rom. 4:7).

13. **Know ye not . . . how shall ye know all parables?** Not simply because, if they could not understand this simple presentation of the truth, they might not expect to comprehend those that were more subtle; but rather if they did not have that spiritual knowledge (lit. *knowledge secured by intuition and insight*) of this parable that would discover the truth it was intended to teach, how could they expect to understand (lit. *know through experience*) the parables generally as they were made acquainted with them by interpretation. Their spiritual receptivity to the truth was that on which rested all their hope of progress in the instruction he purposed for them in these parables.

14-20. In his opening statement (ver. 14), Mark conceives of the seed as **the word**—the Gospel message; but in his following statements (vs. 15-20), the seed becomes those who, under the varying conditions portrayed in the parable, hear the word. The seed by the beaten path represents those whose lack of receptivity makes it impossible for the word to enter into their hearts and bear fruit; the

17. with joy; and they have no root in themselves, but endure for a while; then, when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, straightway they
18. stumble. And others are they that are sown among the thorns; these are they that have heard the word,
19. and the cares of the ¹ world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in, choke
20. the word, and it becometh unfruitful. And those are they that were sown upon the good ground; such as hear the word, and accept it, and bear fruit, thirty-fold, and sixtyfold, and a hundredfold.
21. And he said unto them, Is the lamp brought to be put under the bushel, or under the bed, *and* not to be
22. put on the stand? For there is nothing hid, save that it should be manifested; neither was *anything*

¹ the age.

seed in the rocky soil are those who with shallow emotions receive the word, but are unable to withstand the pressure of unfriendly and hostile surroundings; while the seed in the thorny soil are those who receive the word into natures that are not possessed of singleness of purpose and therefore are open to influences that ultimately destroy its growth. The seed which falls into the good ground represents those who, in a sincere receptivity to spiritual truth (Luke renders it "in an honest and good heart") accept the message of the word and apply its claims to their personal lives (Luke gives it "hold it fast"). With these alone the word comes to fruitage. The parable as a whole pictures thus, not so much the difficulties of the Master's ministry, as the demand which it made for an appreciation of the solemn responsibilities which rested upon those to whom it came with its word of eternal life. There was no lesson better suited to the conditions which were presented in the sifting process that was taking place within the multitude.

21, 22. Following naturally upon this parable of a responsible hearing of the word is the parabolic saying as to the responsible diffusion of its truth. This was doubtless spoken, not to the general multitude, but to the disciples who had come to him for an interpretation of the larger parable, and was intended to further develop its

23. made secret, but that it should come to light. If
 24. any man hath ears to hear, let him hear. And he
 said unto them, Take heed what ye hear: with what
 measure ye mete it shall be measured unto you; and
 25. more shall be given unto you. For he that hath, to
 him shall be given; and he that hath not, from him
 shall be taken away even that which he hath.
 26. And he said, So is the kingdom of God, as if a man

lesson of responsibility. **Lamp**—a small, shallow bowl of earthenware, with its rim at one point pinched inward to hold the wick, or closed over entirely, excepting a small opening in the centre from which the wick protruded. **Bushel**—a small, wooden measure, holding about a peck. **Bed** (lit. *couch*)—a raised framework of wood, covered with cushions and used by day as a sofa. **Stand**—possibly of earthenware and not over three feet in height, on which the lamp bowl was placed. **Save that it should be manifested**: The truth of the kingdom had been kept hidden, but only in order that, at the proper time, it should be spread abroad. That it had been committed to them, therefore, involved an obligation on their part for its proclamation.

23-25. The Master repeats to these disciples the warning he had given to the general multitude, but in a more significant way, because of this their more vital relation to the truth which he had spoken to them. In proportion as they received the truth, not only with an understanding of its meaning, but with a purpose to carry out the object with which it was communicated to them, in that proportion would new truth be revealed to them. The proverbs with which this is enforced are used elsewhere by the Master with other applications, the one in ver. 24, in Matt. 7 : 2 (Lk. 6 : 38); the one in ver. 25, in Matt. 25 : 29 (Lk. 19 : 26). This admonition naturally closes the private conference with the disciples, so that the following two parabolic statements (vs. 26-34) may be taken from the teaching which was resumed in the later part of the day (see note on vs. 35, 36). Luke gives the parable of the Mustard Seed, together with that of the Leaven, as detached sayings in his record of the later Ministry (13 : 18-21). Both of them, however, belong more naturally here, where, in fact, Matthew places them.

26-29. **The blade**—the green blade which first shoots up from the earth (cf. Matt. 13 : 26). **The ear**—into which the blade, having grown into a stalk, heads up (cf. 2 : 23). **The full grain in the ear**—the ripened grain which finally develops in the ear. The teaching is

27. should cast seed upon the earth; and should sleep and rise night and day, and the seed should spring up and grow, he knoweth not how. The earth ¹ beareth fruit of herself; first the blade, then the ear, then the full grain in the ear. But when the fruit ² is ripe, straightway he ³ putteth forth the sickle, because the harvest is come.
30. And he said, How shall we liken the kingdom of God? or in what parable shall we set it forth? ⁴ It is like a grain of mustard seed, which, when it is sown upon the earth, though it be less than all the seeds that are upon the earth, yet when it is sown, groweth up, and becometh greater than all the herbs, and putteth out great branches; so that the birds of the heaven can lodge under the shadow thereof.
33. And with many such parables spake he the word

¹ yieldeth.² alloweth, or is ready.³ sendeth forth.⁴ Grk. as unto.

that the growth of the kingdom is to be a gradual one, and to be carried on by forces which are beyond external control and which, therefore, do not call for anxious care and worry. At the end, however, **when the fruit is ripe**, the coming of the consummation is sudden; for **straightway he putteth forth the sickle, because the harvest is come** (see Hogg, *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*, p. 37f.).

30-32. **A grain of mustard seed** (lit. *a seed grain of mustard*, cf. 1 Cor. 15 : 37; Jn. 12 : 24), which was commonly spoken of as the smallest of seeds (cf. Matt. 17 : 20; Lk. 17 : 6). The plant grows wild and is also cultivated, reaching often to a height of 10 or 12 feet. Its seeds, which it bears in profusion, are favorite fruit for the birds, who settle down on its branches to eat them. The persistence with which this seed grows and spreads and maintains its hold upon the soil, in spite of constant weeding out makes this parable significantly illustrative of the Master's thought that the growth of the kingdom is one that is not to be measured by its small beginnings (see *Expository Times*, Jan. 1913, p. 187).

33, 34. In these closing verses, which review this new method of teaching, the Evangelist has, in the former of them, the disciples

34. unto them, as they were able to hear it; and without a parable spake he not unto them: but privately to his own disciples he expounded all things.
35. And on that day, when even was come, he saith
36. unto them, Let us go over unto the other side. And leaving the multitude, they take him with them, even as he was, in the boat. And other boats were with
37. him. And there ariseth a great storm of wind, and the waves beat into the boat, insomuch that the boat was
38. now filling. And he himself was in the stern, asleep

specifically in view, to whose receptivity to the truth the parables were measured in their lesson-conveying power; but in the latter of them, he has in mind the general multitude, to the receptive portion of whom the teaching of the parables was privately unfolded.

35, 36. **When even was come:** The incident is definitely connected with the day of parable teaching, the crossing to the **other side** being doubtless (in fact, as Matthew distinctly states, 8 : 18, and Mark intimates, ver. 36) to escape the thronging crowds. If, as is most probable, all the preceding parables were spoken on this same day, it is quite likely that the fresh hours of the morning and the cool hours of the late afternoon were given to the gathering in the open, the explanation of the earlier parables being made to the disciples in the interim, when naturally the gathering would be dispersed for rest during the heated hours of the day (cf. Matt. 13 : 36—the parable of the Tares, belonging thus with that of the Sower to the teaching of the forenoon); while it would be almost certain that the reassemblage in the afternoon would be much more largely attended than the one in the morning—the new teaching drawing greater crowds as it became known. **Other boats**—occupied possibly by the specially curious portion of the crowd which was not content to stand upon the beach and listen to the Master speaking from the boat, but crowded closer to him on the water while he spoke, and, when he left in his boat, persisted in following him. If so, they were dispersed by the storm.

37. **A great storm of wind** (lit. *a great hurricane of wind*)—one of those cyclonic wind storms which were accustomed suddenly to sweep down from the mountain gorges that lined the West shores of the lake, and whip its waters into fury. Matthew speaks of it, from its effect upon the water, as an earthquake (Matt. 8 : 24).

38. **The cushion** (lit. *the headrest*)—the low bench at the stern,

on the cushion: and they awake him, and say unto
 39. him, Teacher, carest thou not that we perish? And
 he awoke, and rebuked the wind, and said unto the
 sea, Peace, be still. And the wind ceased, and there
 40. was a great calm. And he said unto them, Why are

on which the steersman might sit, or the captain might rest his head to sleep. As these Galilean boats were small and accommodated at the most but a few persons (cf. 1 : 20), it is clear that Jesus' occupancy of this place not only made it necessary for the steersman to stand, but that the entire Twelve could not have accompanied him on this occasion. Probably, this was again Peter's boat (cf. Lk. 5 : 3) and the only ones with him in it were the three disciples who were now, in this very process of sympathetic sifting among his followers, coming into closer relations to him.

39. **Rebuked . . . be still** (lit. *be muzzled*, cf. 1 Cor. 9 : 9): Though these are the same words used for Jesus' command to evil spirits (1 : 25), and though he rebuked diseases which were popularly supposed to be due to possession (Lk. 4 : 39), there is no reason to believe that they are intended to convey the idea that Jesus believed in the demonic possession of the Lake. He rebuked individuals, where there was no idea of possession (8 : 32f.; 10 : 13, 48). It is simply a part of the graphic description of Oriental imagery. Note the following phrase: **and the wind ceased** (lit. *sank wearied to rest*), and the use by Jesus elsewhere of personification of animate and inanimate nature in address (11 : 14, 23).

40, 41. **Have ye not yet faith?** What Jesus expected of the disciples was not so much a confidence in God's power over the storm—which they might have had as Jews—and his exercise of this power in their behalf, as their Heavenly Father—which they might have had through Jesus' new revelation to them of God—but a confidence in God's possession and exercise of this power, through his own presence with them in the boat. They evidently did not lack reliance in his ability to secure God's power to save them from the storm, for it was this that led them to wake him; but they lacked an appreciation of that power as resident in himself. Their awe, when they saw him quell the waves, shows that what they expected him to do when they waked him was in some way to enlist God's power against the storm in their behalf. Their experience of his personal power so far had been confined to casting out demons and curing diseases, though his power to cure had not stopped short of restoring life to the dead (Lk. 7 : 11-17). This was the first time they had seen him face to face with the relentless forces of nature, and if they thought the sea

41. ye fearful? have ye not yet faith? And they feared exceedingly, and said one to another, Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?
5. And they came to the other side of the sea, into the
2. country of the Gerasenes. And when he was come out of the boat, straightway there met him out of the tombs
3. a man with an unclean spirit, who had his dwelling in the tombs: and no man could any more bind him,

demonized, it was to them at least a more fearful demon than any that possessed the body. Consequently, when the storm subsided, they were filled with awesome dread, because **even the wind and the sea obey him**. It was a faith in God he expected in them, but a faith in God through faith in himself. He did not wish to replace their faith in God with a faith in himself, but to bring their faith in God to a completeness through their faith in himself as related to God; for the faith to which he had finally to bring them and to which he was directing all his ministry with them was a faith in God's Saviorship as possible only through himself. This made indispensable a faith in himself as the Executor of that Salvation, and gives the reason why he made the purpose of his ministry, not so much the impression of his disciples from his miraculous power—though this was necessary if they were to appreciate who he was—nor even their impression from his teaching—though this was necessary if they were to realize what he was to do—but the impression of them with himself; for this was essential if his disciples were to understand that it was their relation to him himself that determined their Salvation.

(10) *The Gerasene Demoniac, 5 : 1-20 (21)*

5 : 1. **Gerasenes:** The scene of this incident is to be identified with a town directly opposite Magdala, the ruined site of which is known as *Gersa*, or *Kersa*. The topographical conditions of this locality satisfy the requirements of the narrative. This town may have been included popularly in the larger territory of Gadara,—the principal city of that region. Such an hypothesis would account for the name in Matthew's record (8 : 28).

2-5. **Tombs:** There are numerous caves in the limestone hills of the Eastern shore, which might be used for burial and to which the demonized man would naturally resort, under the preconceived idea that such places, unclean in themselves, were the haunts of unclean spirits. **Bind him . . . tame him:** It was evidently an exceedingly

4. no, not with a chain; because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been rent asunder by him, and the fetters broken in
5. pieces: and no man had strength to tame him. And always, night and day, in the tombs and in the mountains, he was crying out, and cutting himself with
6. stones. And when he saw Jesus from afar, he ran
7. and worshipped him; and crying out with a loud voice, he saith, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God? I adjure thee by
8. God, torment me not. For he said unto him, Come
9. forth, thou unclean spirit, out of the man. And he asked him, What is thy name? And he saith unto

violent case, which the people had attempted to control for their own safety (cf. Matt. 8 : 28), but with no other result than an increase of its violence, even to the extent of self-injury. **Rent asunder** (lit. *torn to shreds*, cf. Acts 23 : 10). **Broken in pieces** (lit. *crushed*, cf. 14 : 3).

6-8. **Worshipped him:** Here, as in the case of the Capernaum demoniac (1 : 23-26), it was the expression of hostility and fear, and not a conscious moral or ceremonial difference from Jesus. His first approach toward the boat load of people was doubtless due to the general enmity against his fellow men with which he was possessed; but his instinctive recognition of Jesus changed this into a personal hostility, overmastered by a dread which was not wholly due to Jesus' command to come out of the man, as is clear from the parallel case in Capernaum, where the dread was expressed before the command was given (1 : 23f.). Evidently, we have in both cases a profound impression of Jesus' personality upon the personality which controlled the man. **Torment me not**—apparently, the agony which accompanied an absolute expulsion (cf. 1 : 26; 9 : 26), to which expulsion Mark seemingly refers in ver. 10 and Luke in his parallel passage (8 : 31), and which was avoided by the permission finally granted to enter into the swine (vs. 12f.).

9, 10. **Thy name**—addressed, not to the man, but to the demon. This is in accord with exorcistic practice from earliest times, the idea being that by the demon's disclosing his identity it becomes possible to cast him out.

10. him, My name is Legion; for we are many. And he besought him much that he would not send them away
11. out of the country. Now there was there on the mountain side a great herd of swine feeding. And they besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we
13. may enter into them. And he gave them leave. And the unclean spirits came out, and entered into the swine: and the herd rushed down the steep into the sea, *in number* about two thousand; and they were
14. drowned in the sea. And they that fed them fled, and told it in the city, and in the country. And they came
15. to see what it was that had come to pass. And they come to Jesus, and behold ¹ him that was possessed with demons sitting, clothed and in his right mind, *even*

¹ *the demoniac.*

11-13. There are two questions naturally raised by this incident: (a) The psychological one, as to whether animals are subjects of demoniacal possession, and (b) the moral one, as to whether the destruction of property in this case was justifiable. As to (a), we know too little about the influences of personality upon animal intelligence to deny the possibility of such an occurrence as is here narrated; while as to (b), there are too many things to be considered in the incident to permit of a dogmatic judgment against the justifiable character of the act. Its rightness cannot be denied without assuring ourselves that Jesus necessarily knew beforehand the fatal effect which possession of the swine would involve; or that this permission of animal possession was purely arbitrary on his part and not in line with his effort to bring about an expulsion of the demons which would be without torture and so most merciful to the man. In any case—whatever may have been the Master's knowledge of the results and his purpose in the action—the freedom which the community secured from the ever present danger of this violent maniac more than measured up to the loss of the swine, for with the destruction of the animals the demons had no further abiding place in the region.

14-17. **Were afraid:** The keepers of the herd naturally made haste to tell the owners what had happened, and they, as naturally, hur-

16. him that had the legion: and they were afraid. And they that saw it declared unto them how it befell ¹ him that was possessed with demons, and concerning the
 17. swine. And they began to beseech him to depart from
 18. their borders. And as he was entering into the boat, ¹ he that had been possessed with demons besought him
 19. that he might be with him. And he suffered him not, but saith unto him, Go to thy house unto thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done
 20. for thee, and *how* he had mercy on thee. And he

¹ *the demoniac.*

riedly made their way to the scene of the occurrence. The change which they saw in the maniac produced in them the consciousness of an unearthly power in their midst. But when, from those who had witnessed all that had happened, they learned of the vital connection between the cure of the maniac and the destruction of the demonized swine, their fear impelled them to beseech Jesus to leave their country, lest his strange and uncalculable power should bring further losses upon them.

18-20. **Suffered him not:** The request of the healed man may have had behind it a fear lest the demons return to him, if he remained in the country (Matt. 12 : 43-45); it certainly had within it a gratitude for the deliverance from them which Jesus had wrought. It is, consequently, a request which commends itself as most natural. The refusal of it, however, with the following command to publish his cure raises the question why Jesus should have pursued a course here directly contrary to that which he pursued on the other side of the Lake. The only answer is that the conditions were wholly different. The inhabitants of this region were not Jews, nervously ready for a political revolution in the following of a sensationally proclaimed Messiah; nor were his disciples and himself to be allowed to remain among them for any teaching or service. The ministry of this cured man could do no harm, therefore, among the people to whom it was to go; while, without it, there could be no proclamation among them of the good news of the kingdom, even of this crude and immature kind. **Decapolis** (lit. *The Ten Cities*)—a large and undefined region lying generally to the West, East and South of Gersa, including the territory of Gadara, in which Gersa itself probably belonged. The man compassed a much larger region than Jesus pro-

went his way, and began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done for him: and all men marvelled.

21. And when Jesus had crossed over again in the boat unto the other side, a great multitude was gathered
22. unto him; and he was by the sea. And there cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jāirus by name;
23. and seeing him, he falleth at his feet, and beseecheth him much, saying, My little daughter is at the point of death: *I pray thee*, that thou come and lay thy hands on her, that she may be ¹ made whole, and live.
24. And he went with him; and a great multitude followed him, and they thronged him.

¹ *be saved, or recover.*

posed to him, and the enthusiasm with which the Master was received when, later on, he came into this country (7 : 1-8 : 9) may not have been uninfluenced by the story which he published, and at which the people marvelled.

(11) *Jairus' Daughter and the Woman by the Way*, 5 : 21-43 (6 : 1)

21. From ver. 18 it would seem that the return to Capernaum was made immediately upon the close of the preceding incident, while from ver. 2 it would be equally clear that the incident occurred immediately upon their arrival from the other side. This, however, does not necessitate the incident having occurred on the same day as that of the parables.

22, 24. **Rulers of the Synagogue**—administrative officers who superintended the worship of the Synagogue. In the larger synagogues there might be more than one such officer (cf. Acts 13 : 15 and Schürer, II : ii, 63f.). **At the point of death:** The Ruler clearly recognized the serious condition of his daughter. He wished Jesus to cure her, and laid aside all official dignity in order to make strong his appeal. To this extent, he believed in Jesus' power in himself, or with God; but beyond this he apparently did not go, since, when news of her death was brought him, he, equally with the messengers, considered it useless further to trouble the Master. The response which he made to Jesus' appeal that he should not fear, but simply

25. And a woman, who had an issue of blood twelve
 26. years, and had suffered many things of many physi-
 cians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing
 27. bettered, but rather grew worse, having heard the
 things concerning Jesus, came in the crowd behind,
 28. and touched his garment. For she said, If I touch
 29. but his garments, I shall be ¹made whole. And
 straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up;
 and she felt in her body that she was healed of her
 30. ²plague. And straightway Jesus, perceiving in himself

¹be saved, or recover.

²Gk. scourge.

believe, must have been, at best, merely a silent willingness to let Jesus attempt what he could in the case. The daughter whom he believed Jesus could cure was dead, and the courage of hope to which that faith had given rise was replaced by the fear that goes with hopelessness—i.e. that fear which, like a panic, follows the conviction that certain wished for results can never be secured.

25-29. **Touched his garment:** It is quite clear that the reason for her secret approach to the Master was, not only her womanly sensitiveness, but the fact that her disease rendered her ceremonially unclean (Lev. 15 : 19-27). It is equally clear that the reason why she was content to touch the garment of Jesus for her cure was because of a superstitious element in her faith. (Note the same popular idea in the crowds earlier in his ministry, 3 : 10, and later, 6 : 56), though it was not this but the personal element in her faith, that related herself as a sufferer to Jesus as a healer that effected the cure.

30-32. **Power . . . had gone forth:** Mark does not give this as a statement of Jesus himself—as does Luke in his later and perhaps more idealized understanding of the case (8 : 40). It may, therefore, have been but the natural inference of the disciples that this was how the healing—to all appearances without Jesus' personal act—was to be explained; whereas, in fact, Jesus had not only been conscious of a touch, different from the careless contacts of a pressing crowd, but had personally responded to it. (See Garvie, *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*, p. 231; Hogg, *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*, pp. 64-66.)

33, 34. **Fearing and trembling:** She may have feared a rebuke from him, because by her touch she had rendered him ceremonially unclean (Lev. 15 : 19), while she knew also that she had got her cure

- that the power *proceeding* from him had gone forth, turned him about in the crowd, and said, Who touched
31. my garments? And his disciples said unto him, Thou seest the multitude thronging thee, and sayest thou,
32. Who touched me? And he looked round about to
33. see her that had done this thing. But the woman fearing and trembling, knowing what had been done to her, came and fell down before him, and told him
34. all the truth. And he said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath ¹made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy ²plague.
35. While he yet spake, they come from the ruler of the synagogue's *house*, saying, Thy daughter is dead:
36. why troublest thou the Teacher any further? But Jesus, ³not heeding the word spoken, saith unto

¹ *saved thee.*² *Grk., scourge.*³ *overhearing.*

by stealth. More likely, however, this was the outcome of the mental and spiritual effort that had been necessary to bring her to the act, and of the consciousness of the great cure that had been wrought within her. The incident of vs. 30-33 is not given by Matthew. **Thy faith . . . whole:** While Jesus had responded to her act, as far as it had been one of faith, he had not been willing to leave the faith in its crude condition, and so had summoned her to a confession, in order that the personal element in her faith might be brought to its expression and thus confirmed and made strong. It is only after her personal confession that her faith is commended by him.

35, 36. Fear not, only believe: Jesus' demand upon the Ruler was, negatively, to lay aside the panic of his fear, which, of course, would be possible only as the positive element of a stronger faith was realized, since this was the basis on which alone he could act. The Ruler's faith had not considered Jesus practically as one who could do more than cure. The situation, however, was now beyond this point, and the faith which Jesus asked for was one which should be equal to the emergency of death, on the basis of a personal confidence in him as having and exercising a power beyond that even of a superior exorcism. (Note the popular acclaim of Jesus after the

37. the ruler of the synagogue, Fear not, only believe. And he suffered no man to follow with him, save Peter,
 38. and ¹ James, and John the brother of ¹ James. And they come to the house of the ruler of the synagogue; and he beholdeth a tumult, and *many* weeping and
 39. wailing greatly. And when he was entered in, he saith unto them, Why make ye a tumult, and weep? the
 40. child is not dead, but sleepeth. And they laughed him to scorn. But he, having put them all forth, taketh the father of the child and her mother and them that were with him, and goeth in where the child was.

¹ *Jacob.*

raising of the Widow's Son, Lk. 7 : 16). This incident of the message and Jesus' demand for a stronger faith is not given by Matthew.

37-40. **Save Peter, and James and John:** This is the first mention of Jesus' selection of members of the Twelve to be companions with him in his special experiences. (This selection is not referred to by Matthew.) These three were with him later at the Transfiguration (9 : 2) and in Gethsemane (14 : 33). **A tumult**—the uproar made by the professional mourners and flute players (cf. Matt. 9 : 23), who were doubtless stationed in the court, through which Jesus passed on his way to the room. **Why . . . tumult and weep?** This remonstrance doubtless met with no response and was consequently followed by the command to leave the place (cf. Matt. 9 : 24), with the statement of the fact on which the command was based—**the child is not dead but sleepeth:** This is a metaphorical statement, similar to the one made in the case of Lazarus (Jn. 11 : 11-14), and based upon the common Jewish usage of sleep as a figure of death (cf. Matt. 27 : 52; Acts 7 : 60; 13 : 36; 1 Cor. 15 : 20, etc., and frequently in the Old Testament). Jesus recognized the fact that the child was dead, but proclaimed by these words his consciousness of power and his purpose to restore her to life. To suppose that he believed the child was dead when she was not, is to beg the question of his power to raise the dead; to suppose that he knew she was not dead, is to credit him with unusual powers of diagnosis before he had seen the body. Either supposition is improbable. **Laughed him to scorn:** Their boisterous resentment of Jesus' statement—a resentment not unnatural in view of their spiritual inability to recognize the

41. And taking the child by the hand, he saith unto her, Talitha cumi; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I
 42. say unto thee, Arise. And straightway the damsel rose up, and walked; for she was twelve years old. And they were amazed straightway with a great
 43. amazement. And he charged them much that no man should know this: and he commanded that *something* should be given her to eat.
 6. And he went out from thence; and he cometh into

meaning it contained—made necessary their removal from the premises.

41-43. **Arise:** This summons (not given by Matthew, 9 : 25) is identical with that made to the Widow's Son at Nain (Lk. 7 : 14), and practically the same as that to Lazarus in the tomb (Jn. 11 : 43). It is not a summons to the body to awake (4 : 38), but to the soul to resume its living functions in the body (Lk. 8 : 55). **Charged . . . no man should know this:** Apparently, this caution (not referred to by Matthew) was due to the fact that conditions were developing, which, if sensationally intensified, would end all his Galilean work. Two preaching tours had been made, on the latter of which he had been hailed as the Messiah (Matt. 12 : 23), the sifting process was giving more force to the increasing enthusiasm of the sympathetic element among the people, and this enthusiasm might easily be led astray from the spiritual goal to which he wished to bring it to a purely political outcome, as in fact it was, soon after this (Jn. 6 : 14f.). The taking with him of none but the parents and the chosen disciples, and the dismissal of the mourners, shows his desire to reduce the sensation caused by the miracle to its minimum. No such action or command was considered needful, either in the earlier case at Nain, or at the later case at Bethany; but his statement that the maid was not dead, but only asleep, cannot be assigned to this motive without attacking the moral position of Jesus. It was not intended as a cue to the report he wished them to spread abroad, but as a rebuke to the popular lack of faith in him for such an emergency as presented itself in the death of this child.

(12) *The Rejection at Nazareth, 6 : 1-6a*

6 : 1. This incident is recorded by Luke at the beginning of the Galilean ministry (4 : 16-30). It is given with considerable detail and, probably, from sources peculiar to himself. Matthew records it

2. his own country; and his disciples follow him. And when the sabbath was come, he began to teach in the synagogue: and ¹ many hearing him were astonished, saying, Whence hath this man these things? and, What is the wisdom that is given unto this man, and *what mean* such ² mighty works wrought by his hands? Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary,

¹ Some MSS. prefix *the*.

² Grk. *powers*.

at the close of the day of Parables (13 : 54-58). Mark's placing of it is most likely to be historical; for, as he presents it, it seems another attempt on Jesus' part to escape the increasing crowds. At the same time, we must not deny the possibility of Jesus' having visited his home town early in his Galilean work, though it could not have been with the violent results which Luke gives us in his record. These belong to the advanced stage of his ministry, when hostility was rising against him (see note on 3 : 6). **His own country:** This word here and in ver. 4 (Matt. 13 : 54; Lk. 4 : 23f.) has its narrower meaning of 'town,' since Jesus was already in Galilee; in Jn. 4 : 44, it has its more usual meaning of 'country,' since Jesus was going from Judæa into Galilee. Neither Matthew nor Luke make mention of his being accompanied by his disciples.

2, 3. **He began to teach in the synagogue:** Jesus' 'custom,' to which Luke refers (4 : 16), was his custom in the earlier years in Nazareth of worshipping in the home synagogue; his teaching, either in this or in other synagogues, was only through invitation of the officials. **Many . . . were astonished:** Jesus' discourse, which was based on what was apparently the lesson for the day as given in Isa. 61 : 1f. (Lk. 4 : 18), produced on the greater portion of his audience an unfortunate impression. They admitted its **wisdom**, they recognized also the significance of the **mighty works** reported to have been done by him throughout Galilee, but they could not account for these things in one whom they had known simply as the **carpenter**, the son of one of the village households, a man who had grown up among themselves; least of all did they relish the application which he doubtless made of the Scripture he had read (cf. Lk. 4 : 21). As a consequence, **they were offended in him**, *i.e.* they resented the fact that he, being to them the commonplace man that he was, should intrude himself upon them, not only as an interpreter of God's word, but as the one in whom its prophecies of Messianic times were fulfilled. **Mary:** Luke's phrasing of the people's exclamation indicates their natural reference to Jesus as Joseph's son (4 : 22;

- and brother of ¹ James, and Joses, and Judas, and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us? And
4. they were ² offended in him. And Jesus said unto them, A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own
5. house. And he could there do no ³ mighty work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk, and
6. healed them. And he marvelled because of their unbelief.

And he went round about the villages teaching.

¹ *Jacob.*

² *Grk. caused to stumble.*

³ *Grk. power.*

cf. Jn. 6 : 42); the mention by Mark of only his Mother's name is unusual and has significant bearing on the question whether his Father was still alive. **Brother:** These four, whose names are given only here and in the parallel passage in Matthew (13 : 55—"Joseph" being merely another form of "Joses"), were, most probably, full brothers of Jesus. **Here with us:** The reference to his sisters as being resident in Nazareth may indicate that they were married and living in homes of their own in that place.

4-6a. **A prophet is not without honor:** This is Jesus' way of accounting for the manner of his reception. It was not because he came back to his townspeople as one of themselves; but because, as one of themselves, he came back to them as a prophet. As a general thing, people do not willingly accept the preaching of one whom they consider no better than themselves. This is strikingly true when one preaches to his own kinsfolk and within his own home. (For the use of this same proverb on another occasion, see Jn. 4 : 44.) **He could do there no mighty work:** The reason for Jesus' rejection at Nazareth, as in the case of every prophet, was the strange failure to appreciate him on the part of those who should have been able best to understand him. Another reason was the lack of spiritual sympathy with him and his work that made it impossible for him to carry on his work in their midst. Such small acts of healing as he did accomplish must have preceded this discourse in the synagogue, since it was followed by his expulsion from the town (cf. Lk. 4 : 28-30). Perhaps, the meagreness of this healing added to their unfavorable opinion of him, as Jesus analyzed it (cf. Lk. 4 : 23). **Marvelled**—not in the sense of being unable to account for it; since he had shown the reason for it and had confronted it with the results which inevitably must

7. And he calleth unto him the twelve, and began to send them forth by two and two; and he gave them
8. authority over the unclean spirits; and he charged them that they should take nothing for *their* journey, save a staff only; no bread, no wallet, no money
9. in their purse; but *to go* shod with sandals: and, *said*

follow upon it (cf. Lk. 4 : 25-27), but in the sense of condemning it as that which he had no reason to expect. In this same sense—but from the contrary point of view—he had marvelled at the Centurion's faith (Matt. 8 : 10).

(13) *A Third Preaching Tour, 6 : 6b-13*

(For the Second Tour see note on 3 : 19b-21.)

6b. **He went about the villages teaching:** Beyond this single sentence, Mark does not refer to the incidents of this tour, while Luke makes no mention of the tour at all. Matthew, however, summarizes its happenings at the close of his first group of miracles (9 : 35; vs. 36-38 are probably connected with other events).

7. It is in connection with this tour that the Twelve are sent out. Their mission is not likely to have been to the villages involved in the itinerary, but to a wider range of territory, which it would have been impossible for him alone to reach (cf. vs. 11-13), which seem to indicate a mission belonging distinctly to the Twelve, and ver. 14, where the information which came to Herod seems to have depended on a more extensive spread of a heralding and wonder-working ministry than would have been comprised in a single circuit of villages such as he was making (cf. also Matt. 10 : 5). The motive for this mission was doubtless Jesus' consciousness of a growing hostility against him, so strikingly called to his mind by his experience at Nazareth. This would naturally urge him to a speedy spreading of the announcement of the Kingdom throughout Galilee before his ministry there should be brought to a close. **Two and two**—enough for companionship, not enough for controversy (cf. 9 : 33-35; Lk. 22 : 24). **Authority over the unclean spirits:** As is clear from ver. 13, this was accompanied with power to heal diseases (Lk. 9 : 2; cf. also Matt. 10 : 1; Lk. 9 : 1f.), and, from Matthew's statement (10 : 8), even with power to raise the dead; while the command to herald the nearness of the kingdom (cf. Matt. 10 : 7) and to call upon the people to repent (cf. ver. 12) appears to have formed the essential feature of their commission.

8, 9. These verses contain restrictions as to the equipment of the missionaries for their journey. The purpose of these restrictions

10. *he*, put not on two coats. And he said unto them,
 Wheresoever ye enter into a house, there abide till
 11. ye depart thence. And whatsoever place shall not
 receive you, and they hear you not, as ye go forth
 thence, shake off the dust that is under your feet for a
 12. testimony unto them. And they went out, and

was evidently to impress upon them the seriousness of their mission. They are not to consider so much their comfort and convenience as their work; for the situation, as the Master saw it, was urgent. **A staff**—always taken by the traveller, whatever else he might omit (cf. Gen. 32 : 10). Matthew and Luke prohibit even this. **Wallet**—a leathern sack for carrying provisions (cf. 2 Kings 4 : 42). **Money** (lit. *brass*)—the common coin of Palestine. Luke substitutes “silver” and Matthew adds “no gold, nor silver.” **Purse** (lit. *girdle*)—used for carrying small change, or for secreting larger sums. Different from the bag referred to in Lk. 10 : 4; 22 : 35f. **Sandals**—a sole of leather, or wood, bound to the foot with thongs. Matthew’s term “shoes” (10 : 10) which he forbids, clearly refers to the same article. Luke makes no mention of them. **Coats**—the tunic, or undergarment, worn next to the skin. In Matt. 5 : 40, it is distinguished from the “cloak,” which was the mantle or outer garment thrown over the tunic (cf. also Jn. 19 : 23; Acts 9 : 39).

10, 11. The directions in these two verses continue the purpose of impressing upon the Twelve the urgent character of their mission. When they have found a lodging (Matthew adds that they are to select only such as is “worthy”; cf. 10 : 11-13), they are to remain in it until their mission in the place is finished. They are not to change from house to house, seeking better entertainment (cf. Lk. 10 : 7); for their object in the lodging is not to secure a place of ease, but a center of work. On the other hand, should the place to which they come not receive them or their message, they are not to delay and attempt to win the people of the place from their unfriendliness, but to depart, testifying, through a well known symbolic act, not only their own freedom from responsibility in the case, but the barrier to fellowship which their unreceptive action had established (cf. Acts 13 : 51; 18 : 6). Matthew extends these directions to great length (10 : 15-42), incorporating among them, apparently, some sayings from later occasions (e.g. vs. 17-22; cf. also 34-36, 38f.); while Luke has reproduced the substance of the Matthew version in connection with a subsequent mission of a larger group of disciples (10 : 1-16).

12, 13. **Anointed with oil**—a familiar specific in the medical treatment of that time. It was used, consequently, as a symbol of the

13. preached that *men* should repent. And they cast out many demons, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.
14. And king Herod heard *thereof*; for his name had become known: and ¹ he said, John the Baptizer is risen from the dead, and therefore do these powers
15. work in him. But others said, It is Elijah. And others
16. said, *It is* a prophet, *even* as one of the prophets. But Herod, when he heard *thereof*, said, John, whom I

¹ Some MSS. read *they*.

divine healing which they were ministering. The practice seems to have been continued in the early Church (cf. Jas. 5 : 14).

(14) *Herod's Opinion of Jesus, with the Story of the Baptist's Imprisonment and Death, 6 : 14-29*

14-16. **King Herod**—Herod Antipas, by the will of his father, Herod the Great, appointed tetrarch of Galilee and Peræa, one of the four portions into which this ruler divided his kingdom among his sons. Over those countries he ruled from 4 B.C. until 37 A.D., maintaining a policy of friendliness to the Romans and of shrewd regard for the religious scruples of the Jews. He interested himself in the building of cities, his greatest undertaking being the erection of Tiberias, on the Sea of Galilee (Jn. 6 : 23), which he made his capital, and which gave its name to the Lake (Jn. 6 : 1; 21 : 1). This Herod is the one most frequently mentioned in the New Testament (8 : 15; Lk. 3 : 1, 19; 8 : 3; 13 : 31f.; 23 : 7-15; Acts 4 : 27; 13 : 1). Mark gives him here his courtesy title of "king"; Matthew and Luke, his more accurate title of "tetrarch" (Matt. 14 : 1; Lk. 9 : 7). **Heard thereof**: It is not likely, from such statements as are made in 1 : 28 and 3 : 8, that this was the first information of Jesus that had come to Herod. Doubtless, this last preaching tour, together with the wider mission of the Twelve, had greatly spread the fame of his ministry, and brought it anew to the hearing of the King; but even then, it would not have arrested his attention, had it not been for the conjectures which accompanied it and which were, in all probability, due to the spirit of Messianic expectancy among the people (cf. Lk. 3 : 15; Matt. 12 : 23). These conjectures were confused: Some said that **John, the Baptizer, is risen from the dead** (cf. Lk. 9 : 7). The fact that John had been held to be a prophet; that he had been wickedly put to death; and that Jesus was preaching the same mes-

17. beheaded, he is risen. For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John, and bound him in prison for the sake of Herodias, his brother Philip's
 18. wife; for he had married her. For John said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's

sage of the nearness of the kingdom as he had preached, would not make unnatural the superstitious idea that this man of God had returned to life, with supernatural powers (**therefore do these powers work in him**, cf. Jn. 10 : 41). Others, less credulous, gave expression to the common belief, founded on Mal. 4 : 5, that **Elijah** would come as a precursor of the Messiah (cf. 9 : 11f.; Matt. 11 : 14), and identified him with that prophet with whom John himself had refused to be identified (Jn. 1 : 21); while others, not knowing how to identify him, held him to be one of the old prophets come again to earth (cf. Lk. 9 : 8; Matt. 16 : 14). The guilty conscience of Herod, in spite of the Sadducean scepticism to which he was more than likely predisposed (cf. Matt. 16 : 11 with Mk. 8 : 14), was not only startled by these conjectures, but it fixed upon the one that made Jesus out to be the resurrected John.

17, 18. The story of John's imprisonment and death is here introduced, to account for the statement of his beheading. Matthew has an extended account of this event (Matt. 14 : 1-12), though not as detailed as Mark's. Luke makes, however, nothing more than a mere mention of the fact (3 : 19f.). **Laid hold . . . bound him in prison**: This was done before Jesus began his Galilean work (1 : 14); in fact, it seems to have been the reason for his leaving Judæa and going into Galilee (Matt. 4 : 12; see note on 1 : 14). He was imprisoned in the fortress attached to the palace of Machærus—a rocky citadel, on the East side of the Dead Sea, opposite the wilderness of Judæa and thus within sight of the scene of his early work. His captivity continued until well after the beginning of Jesus' Galilean work (Matt. 11 : 2f.; Lk. 7 : 18), though Matthew can hardly be accurate in making his death to have occurred as late as at the close of this mission of the Twelve (14 : 12-14). **Herodias**—the daughter of Aristobulus, the son of Herod the Great and Mariamme, granddaughter of Hyrcanus II. She was, therefore, niece, not only of Antipas, but of his half-brother Philip, her first husband. This Philip was not the tetrarch of Ituræa (Lk. 3 : 1), but another half-brother of Antipas, son of Herod's third wife, Mariamme, daughter of Simon, the High Priest. **Not lawful**: As wife of his brother, who was still living, the marriage came under the strict prohibitions of the law (cf. Lev. 18 : 16).

19. wife. And Herodias set herself against him, and de-
 20. sired to kill him; and she could not; for Herod feared
 John, knowing that he was a righteous and holy man,
 and kept him safe. And when he heard him, he ¹ was
 21. much perplexed; and he heard him gladly. And
 when a convenient day was come, that Herod on
 his birthday made a supper to his lords, and the ² high
 22. captains, and the chief men of Galilee; and when ³ the
 daughter of Herodias herself came in and danced,

¹ Many MSS. read *did many things*.

² *military tribunes* Grk. *chiliarchs*.

³ Some MSS. read *his daughter Herodias*.

19, 20. **Set herself against him:** Herodias' attitude toward the Baptist was one of murderous hatred; Herod's, because of the monitions of conscience, was one of fear mingled with appreciation. His imprisonment of the preacher was due, not so much to personal anger, as to dread of his influence among the people (cf. Matt. 14 : 5). In fact, by imprisoning him he sought to prevent, not only his possible rousing of the people against him (cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII, v. 2), but, according to our Evangelist, the wreaking of Herodias' wrath upon him; since this would only have inflamed the people's feelings and disturbed his own, for he knew **that he was a righteous and holy man**, and so **he kept him safe**. With this attitude toward him, it was natural that frequently he should send for him, to hear him discourse, and just as natural that the discourse, though approved by his moral sense, should leave him in a confusion of purpose and an impotence of will.

21. **Convenient**—*i.e.* for the realizing of Herodias' purpose. There was more likelihood of securing the King's consent to her wish in the flushed excitement of such a festivity as this than when the sober thoughts of his personal and political responsibilities controlled him. **Lords:** These were the chief civil dignitaries of his tetrarchy, as the **high captains** were its chief military officials (cf. Rev. 6 : 15); while the **chief men of Galilee** were most likely the nobility of the province, representing the native population, as over against the civil and military officials, who were, in all probability, foreign.

22-29. **The daughter of Herodias**—Salome, who afterwards married Philip, the tetrarch of Trachonitis, her maternal uncle, and later, Aristobulus, King of Chalcis. The implacable hatred of Herodias is seen in this willingness to degrade her daughter, a princess, to the level of the hired dancers, who belonged to a confessedly im-

- ¹ she pleased Herod and them that sat at meat with him; and the king said unto the damsel, Ask of me
 23. whatsoever thou wilt, and I will give it thee. And he sware unto her, Whatsoever thou shalt ask of me,
 24. I will give it thee, unto the half of my kingdom. And she went out, and said unto her mother, What shall I ask? And she said, The head of John the Baptizer,
 25. And she came in straightway with haste unto the king, and asked, saying, I will that thou forthwith
 26. give me on a platter the head of John the Baptist. And the king was exceeding sorry; but for the sake of his oaths, and of them that sat at meat, he would not

¹ *it.*

moral class, in the hope of entrapping the king into her plot against the Baptist. If the marginal reading "his daughter Herodias"—which is better attested—should be substituted for the text, it would indicate that the maid was a namesake of her mother and a child of the present marriage. It is not likely, however, that Herodias would assign Herod's own child to such a task. Her hope was realized, for the dancing of the girl **pleased Herod**, and he bade her ask of him what she would, confirming it with an oath that committed him to the granting of her request, even to the half of his kingdom (cf. Esther 5 : 3, 6; 7 : 2). While the daughter and the mother doubtless were in full sympathy with each other, it is clear that the girl had not been let into the details of the plot; for she had to seek Herodias in order to learn what request she was to make. In fact, that a request was permitted her was evidently a surprise, for the King's following of his statement with an oath was most likely due to the hesitancy of her first astonishment at his words (Matthew's record, 14 : 6-12, is manifestly contracted). Whether Salome needed urging—as Matthew's phrase, "being put forward by her mother," might seem to imply—or not, she promptly presents to the King her mother's wish, an essential part of which was the demand for its immediate fulfilment. This would indicate that the banquet was held in the palace of Machærus. The King's sorrow was an admixture of genuine vexation and grief (cf. Lk. 18 : 23), which, however, was not strong enough to overcome the fancied honor involved in his rash oath—an oath which in his vassal relations to Rome could never

27. reject her. And straightway the king sent forth a soldier of his guard, and commanded to bring his head:
 28. and he went and beheaded him in the prison, and brought his head on a platter, and gave it to the
 29. damsel; and the damsel gave it to her mother. And when his disciples heard *thereof*, they came and took up his corpse, and laid it in a tomb.
 30. And the apostles gather themselves together unto Jesus; and they told him all things, whatsoever they
 31. had done, and whatsoever they had taught. And he saith unto them, Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place, and rest a while. For there were many coming and going, and they had no leisure so much
 32. as to eat. And they went away in the boat to a desert
 33. place apart. And *the people* saw them going, and many knew *them*, and they ran together there ¹ on foot

¹ by land.

have been literally fulfilled, and which now was being kept probably more through a pride in his relations towards those that were with him at the banquet than through any regard for the character of his oath as such. **A soldier of his guard** (lit. a *spy*, or *scout*)—a term applied to soldiers employed to keep a lookout or carry despatches. They formed a distinct corps and were employed by the emperors as a bodyguard, in which capacity they would naturally be selected for the carrying out of imperial sentences (cf. Schürer, I, ii, 63). Herod seems to have had some such bodyguard, from whose members he selected one to execute his sentence upon the Baptist. **Platter** (A. V. "charger")—a flat dish, either of earthenware or metal. **The disciples . . . took up his corpse and laid it in a tomb:** Their permission to bury the body was due, doubtless, to Herod's sorrowful realization of what he had been allured into allowing to be done.

(15) *The Feeding of the Five Thousand*, 6 : 30-44 (56)

30-33. **The Apostles:** Mark here gives the disciples the name by which they were better known when he wrote, not in its official sense, but as an appropriate designation of those who had been "sent forth"

34. from all the cities, and outwent them. And he came forth and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd: and he began to teach them many things.
35. And when the day was now far spent, his disciples came unto him, and said, The place is desert, and the

on this tour and were now returning from it (cf. 6 : 7). **Gather themselves . . . unto Jesus**—from the various directions in which they had gone, to some previously appointed place, obviously on the Western side of the Lake and most likely Capernaum. **Come . . . into a desert place and rest**—not in the immediate neighborhood of their gathering place (see notes on 1 : 35, 45), but across the Lake (as in 4 : 35), quite probably in the neighborhood of Bethsaida Julias (cf. Lk. 9 : 10, 12). **They ran . . . there on foot**—around the North end of the Lake, having seen them depart and surmising their destination from the direction in which they were headed. Naturally, they told of their quest as they went, and so added to their numbers **from all the cities** through which they passed. Eventually, Mark says, they reached the other side of the Lake ahead of them. This might be possible, if the wind was light or contrary; since the distance by land was but ten miles, while that by water was four. The record of the Fourth Gospel, however, would seem to indicate that Jesus and the disciples reached the other side first and went up the mountain to their place of retirement, from which, later on, Jesus beheld the multitude and came down to them (Jn. 6 : 1-5).

34. **Came forth**—from the boat. **Had compassion on them**—in spite of their having prevented his plan for retirement; because, through this impulsive and eager following of him, there was brought to him afresh their need of and readiness for a true religious leadership. So, putting aside his desire for rest, **he began to teach them many things**—not in the sense of diversified themes, for evidently there was but the one theme of the kingdom of God (cf. Lk. 9 : 11), but in the sense of an abundance of teaching on this one theme.

35-38. **The day was . . . far spent**: The Passover being near, it would be the time of the Spring Equinox, the sun setting about six o'clock; so that the teaching had continued into the late afternoon. **The place is desert**, and, consequently, the people, who in their hurry had brought no provisions with them, could get food for their long delayed meal only by being dismissed and allowed to go to the surrounding **country** (lit. *tiled fields, farms*, cf. 5 : 14) and nearby **villages**. According to John (6 : 5), the colloquy was begun by

36. day is now far spent; send them away, that they may go into the country and villages round about, and buy
 37. themselves somewhat to eat. But he answered and said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they say unto him, Shall we go and buy two hundred shillings'
 38. worth of bread, and give them to eat? And he saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? go *and* see. And when they knew, they say, Five, and two fishes.
 39. And he commanded them that all should ¹ sit down

¹ *recline, lie down.*

Jesus. The following answer of the disciples gives us really a combination of John's statement, of Jesus' query, and of Philip's reply. **Shall we go and buy:** The disciples had no idea of Jesus' plan, and, apparently, no appreciation of his power over the supplies of nature (cf. Jn. 6 : 9). The incident at the Wedding Feast at Cana had been forgotten; the recent stilling of the storm may have assured them of his control of Nature, but it had led them to no inference as to his power immediately to create what Nature produces. **Two hundred shillings** (lit. *denarii*) **worth:** The *denarius* was the day wage of the laborer (Matt. 20 : 2)—somewhat less than twenty cents. Two hundred *denarii*—about forty dollars—would be far more than the disciples had in their common purse, and would represent their conviction as to the hopelessness of the undertaking (cf. 14 : 5; Lk. 7 : 41). **How many loaves have ye?** They may not have had any provisions, expecting to supply themselves from the villages as they had need, during their absence (cf. Jn. 4 : 8). According to the Fourth Evangelist (6 : 8f.), it is Andrew who discovers the **five loaves** (a small flat cake, fairly thick, about the size of a plate, sufficient for a meal; cf. Lk. 11 : 5f.), which he says were made of barley (the grain of the poor; cf. 2 Kings 7 : 18), and the **two fishes** (cooked or dried, as a relish with the bread; cf. Jn. 21 : 9, 13), in the possession of a lad who, doubtless attracted by the crowd, was offering them for sale.

39-44. **By companies** (lit. *symposia by symposia*)—to secure an orderly arrangement for the distribution of the food. **Green grass**—the fresh, young grass of the springtime. **In ranks** (lit. *garden plots by garden plots*)—rectangular groups, with passageways between them. **Looking up to heaven:** This marked the Master's consciousness of the significance of what he was about to do (cf. 7 : 34; Jn. 11 : 41), the blessing of the food (see Edersheim, I, p. 684, for the usual form), and the breaking of the bread—the loaves, being relatively

40. by companies upon the green grass. And they sat
 41. down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties. And he
 took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking
 up to heaven, he blessed, and brake the loaves; and
 he gave to the disciples to set before them; and the two
 42. fishes divided he among them all. And they all ate,
 43. and were filled. And they took up broken pieces,
 44. twelve basketfuls, and also of the fishes. And they
 that ate the loaves were five thousand men.
 45. And straightway he constrained his disciples to
 enter into the boat, and to go before *him* unto the
 other side to Bethsaida, while he himself sendeth the
 46. multitude away. And after he had taken leave of

thin, were never cut—were the custom in the daily meal (cf. Lk. 24 : 30; Acts 27 : 35). From the following statement by all the Synop-
 tists, as well as by John, it is clear that what took place was to them
 distinctly miraculous. The five loaves and the two fishes were dis-
 tributed among the multitude of **five thousand, and they all ate
 and were filled**, and they took up of the fragments remaining **twelve
 basketfuls**. As far as historical criticism can go in accrediting a
 miracle, the evidence is complete; the only thing that will call it in
 question is the presence of hostile presuppositions in the mind of the
 critic. The discourse which in the Fourth Gospel follows this event,
 gives no reason to believe that in the Master's mind there was any
 forecast of the Passover Meal in this provision which he made for
 the multitude's needs. The language in that discourse, which specifi-
 cally refers to the coming sacrifice of himself (vs. 51-58), is occasioned
 simply by the developed argument involved in the presentation over
 against their material view of his Messiahship of the profoundly spir-
 itual character of his mission and of their personal relationship to
 him. In fact, with the estimate which that discourse shows he had
 of their hopelessly material attitude toward his work (ver. 26), he
 could hardly have had in this meal provided for their needs a foretaste
 of the communion of the Passover meal with his disciples.

45, 46. **Straightway he constrained his disciples . . . to go
 before him unto the other side:** The reason for this sudden reversal
 of his plan of retirement is given in the Fourth Gospel (6 : 14f.). The
 provision for the people's needs had carried their enthusiasm beyond

47. them, he departed into the mountain to pray. And when even was come, the boat was in the midst of
 48. the sea, and he alone on the land. And seeing them distressed in rowing, for the wind was contrary unto them, about the fourth watch of the night he cometh unto them, walking on the sea; and he would have

the acknowledgment of him as a prophet to a determination to proclaim him as their revolutionary leader. Possibly, to withdraw his disciples from the contagion of such ideas, certainly to secure for himself the quiet of communion with God, he sends them across the bay which separated the place of the feeding from the city of **Bethsaida**. (Mentioned only by Mark; Matthew says simply "unto the other side," 14 : 22; John, making no reference to the Master's instructions, speaks of them as "going over the sea unto Capernaum," 6 : 17, their final gathering place, 6 : 24, 59): There is no certain evidence of the existence of another city of this name on the Western side of the Lake. There may have been near the newer Greek Bethsaida Julias an older Jewish Bethsaida, to which such references as Jn. 12 : 21 would apply and to which Jesus would resort in preference to the more fashionable Greek city (see Guthe's suggestion, *Bibel-wörterbuch*, *sub voce* and plates 14 and 13 of his *Bibel-Atlas*; also Sanday's *Sacred Sites*, p. 48 and Map). **Taken leave of them**—the multitude, to dismiss whom he remains after sending his disciples away. The multitude referred to in the Fourth Gospel as still on the Eastern side of the Lake the next day, 6 : 22, were the enthusiasts whom the Evangelist conceives of as remaining on the ground overnight to witness more wonders and to be fed again, ver. 26,—possibly to carry out their revolutionary plans, ver. 15. **To pray**: He clearly foresaw the crisis to which the political enthusiasm of the multitude was bringing his work, and sought in this way to prepare himself for it. If the recent death of the Baptist had foreboded danger to himself (see Lk. 13 : 31-33, during his later journey to Jerusalem), still the desire to withdraw to the retired regions of the Eastern shore of the Lake was more to afford his disciples rest after the strain of their tour and, for himself, to escape the ever-increasing crowd that pressed upon him, than to get beyond the reach of Herod. The political outburst of the multitude had introduced a new and alarming element into the situation, to meet which he saw no preparation save in prayer.

47-52. **When even was come**: The sun had set (the Fourth Gospel states definitely that it was dark, 6 : 17), and the Passover moon had risen. Jesus was thus enabled to distinguish the boat **in the midst of**

49. passed by them: but they, when they saw him walking on the sea, supposed that it was a ghost, and cried out;
 50. for they all saw him, and were troubled. But he straightway spake with them, and saith unto them,
 51. Be of good cheer: it is I; be not afraid. And he went up unto them into the boat; and the wind ceased:

the sea (not geographically, but relatively to the land, *i.e.* in deep water), as it labored against the wind that had risen and was driving it down and across the Lake towards the Western shore. But evidently he did not altogether forego his vigil, for it was not until **the fourth watch of the night** (from 3 to 6 A.M., Roman reckoning) that he came to them. By this time, the disciples, in spite of their efforts, had been driven in a tortuous course far from their intended landing place. (The Fourth Gospel says they had gone 25 or 30 stadia, *i.e.* 3 or 4 miles, 6 : 19.) The moon had set and the wind was still against them. At this unexpected hour and to them most unnatural place, the Master appears **walking on the sea**: This was a control of the forces of nature seemingly more real, but in fact not more so than his stilling of the storm (4 : 35-41). It admits of no naturalistic explanation. Its only alternative is pure legend, to account for which requires ingenuity. **Would have passed them by**: Doubtless, his purpose was to recall to their minds the lesson he had sought to teach them in his stilling of the storm—that his mere presence with them should be enough to assure them in any trouble. Had they thoroughly learned that lesson, they might have believed his presence would have been granted them in this present difficulty; but they were slow of heart and were not expecting him; so that, in the darkness, they thought what they saw was a **ghost** (lit. *a phantom, an apparition*; cf. Job 4 : 15ff.), and they **cried out** in fear (cf. 1 : 23). Indeed, according to Matthew (14 : 28-32), though Jesus reassured them as to his identity (cf. Lk. 24 : 37ff.), they were not all convinced—at least Peter demanded additional proof, which, in its working out, disclosed the smallness of his faith in the protecting power of Jesus' presence. **The wind ceased**: This should have brought vividly to them their experience in the storm (4 : 39), but they were **sore amazed**—not with awesome fear, as had been the case when the storm ceased (4 : 41), but with an astonishment at results which were not looked for in his presence, in spite of the marvel of the feeding of the multitude but a few hours before (see their even later failure to appreciate this miracle, 8 : 14-21). Matthew states that this amazement expressed itself in a confession of his Messiahship (14 : 33), which would be understood better as the result of the maturer Messianic convictions

52. and they were sore amazed in themselves; for they understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was hardened.
53. And when they had crossed over, they came to the land unto Gennesaret, and moored to the shore.
54. And when they were come out of the boat, straightway
55. *the people* knew him, and ran round about that whole region, and began to carry about on their ¹ beds
56. those that were sick, where they heard he was. And wheresoever he entered, into villages, or into cities, or into the country, they laid the sick in the market-places, and besought him that they might touch if it were but the border of his garment: and as many as touched ² him were made whole.

¹ *pallets.*² *it.*

uttered by Peter some months afterwards at Cæsarea Philippi (8 : 29), as would also his confession at the close of Jesus' discourse delivered in the Capernaum synagogue the following day (Jn. 6 : 69).

53-56. **Crossed over they came to the land unto Gennesaret** (better *Crossed over to the land, they came unto Gennesaret*): The ceasing of the wind enabled them to make progress in such direction as they wished; but, as the Master was now with them and they had been driven so far from Bethsaida, they proceeded towards the Western shore, landing considerably South of Capernaum, at the Plain of Genessaret. **Carry about . . . where they heard he was:** As soon as they landed, Jesus was recognized, and the report of his return (cf. vs. 32f.) was spread abroad through the towns and villages of that region, which was thickly populated. As a result, they brought to him the sick, following up the rumor of his whereabouts, until they found him. **Villages . . . cities . . . the country** (lit. *tilled fields, farms*, cf. ver. 36; 5 : 14)—evidently the localities of that region through which he passed on his way back to Capernaum where, according to the Fourth Gospel, he finally came—possibly that same day (cf. Jn. 6 : 24, 59). **Market places:** Strictly, these would be found only in the cities, but the phrase may here be used generally for any open places in the villages and smaller settlements, where room could be had to gather the sick around Jesus. **The**

7. And there are gathered together unto him the Pharisees, and certain of the scribes, who had
2. come from Jerusalem, and had seen that some of his disciples ate their bread with defiled, that
3. is, unwashen, hands. (For the Pharisees, and all

border of his garment (lit. *the fringe, or tassel, of his outer garment*): Jesus doubtless wore attached to the four corners of his outer garment, as required by the Law of every Jew, tassels of twisted threads of white wool, bound to the garment by a cord of blue (cf. Num. 15 : 38-40). **Made whole**: These cases were not essentially different from that of the Woman in the crowd, except that Jesus was appealed to before the touch was made. There was here, as with her, a mixture of superstition and faith—the latter, though slight, being sincere and consequently effective to a cure (cf. 5 : 20, 27-29, and especially the record by Matthew, 9 : 20, and Luke, 8 : 44).

(16) *Ceremonial Criticism of the Pharisees and Scribes, 7 : 1-23*

7 : 1, 2. According to the Fourth Gospel, when Jesus finally reached Capernaum, the enthusiasts who had followed him across the Lake from the place of the feeding of the multitude, found him and, evidently approaching him again in their spirit of political revolution, drew from him the discourse on the Bread of Life which effectually alienated them and, in fact, most of his disciples from his Ministry (cf. Jn. 6 : 22-66). It may have been in view of this popular defection from him that the Pharisees and Scribes were emboldened to return to their criticism of the unceremonialism which he had countenanced and which was still carried on by the disciples who remained in his fellowship. **From Jerusalem**: This attack did not necessarily take place immediately after the discourse. In fact, the presence of certain Scribes who had come up from Jerusalem would seem to indicate that it had originated there, in which case the Passover referred to in Jn. 6 : 4 may have taken place, and reports carried to the city of the people's Messianic enthusiasm for Jesus, with their later defection from him may have alarmed and at the same time allured the religious leaders to a renewed attack. **Defiled** (lit. *common*, cf. Acts 10 : 14; Rom. 14 : 14; Rev. 21 : 27) . . . **unwashen hands**: The occasion of the attack was doubtless some meal at which the disciples were seen to be eating without first having observed the universal rule of washing the hands, not so much for sanitary purposes as to cleanse them from all unceremonial contacts which they may have had.

- 3, 4. From the beginning, the religious leaders had seen that

- the Jews, except they wash their hands ¹ diligently,
 4. eat not, holding the tradition of the elders; and
when they come from the market-place, except they
² bathe themselves, they eat not; and many other
 things there are, which they have received to hold,
 5. ³ washings of cups, and pots, and brasen vessels.⁴) And

¹ *up to the elbow.*² Some MSS. read *sprinkle themselves.*³ Grk. *baptizings.*⁴ Many MSS. add *and couches.*

the vital issue between Jesus and themselves was at the point of ceremonialism (see notes on 2 : 6f.). They had already criticized him for various infringements of its more exact rules (see notes on 2 : 16, 24). Now, however, they seem to have determined to go to the root of the matter; for they select a custom that was observed, not only by the **Pharisees**, but by **all the Jews** (not necessarily the masses, but rather the religiously inclined portion of the people), seeking thus to place him in opposition to the common life of the religious people. These verses are a parenthesis, in which Mark gives a few examples to show the extent to which this custom had laid hold of their daily living. **Diligently** (Gr. *with the fist*)—most likely by alternately rubbing the open hand with the other hand clenched, so as to thoroughly cleanse it. **The tradition of the elders**—not the Mosaic Law, but the precepts of former Scribes and teachers—particularly the members of the Great Synagogue—handed down and added to from generation to generation, and finally embodied in the Mishna (cf. Gal. 1 : 14). **Bathe themselves**: Whether this was by sprinkling (cf. Num. 19 : 9ff.), or by immersion (cf. 2 Kings 5 : 14), it was an application of water to the entire body, in view of the more extensive defilement they were supposed to have incurred in mingling with the non-Jewish crowds and unclean objects of the market place. (Note Moffatt's conjectural reading: "They decline to eat what comes from the market place till they have washed it.") *A New Translation of the New Testament*, Second Edition, 1913). **Washings of cups . . . pots . . . brasen vessels**: Whatever the mode, these purifications also involved the complete cleansing of the utensils. The cups were ordinary drinking cups of earthenware or metal (cf. 9 : 41; 14 : 23); the pots were pitchers of wood or stone (cf. Lev. 15 : 12; Jn. 2 : 6); the brasen vessels were cooking pots of copper or brass (1 Sam. 2 : 14; 2 Chron. 35 : 13). See Schürer, *Jewish People*, II, ii, p. 106ff. Edersheim, *Life of the Messiah*, II, p. 9ff.

5-13. Jesus' reply is measured by the significance of the criticism. He also goes to the heart of the question. And so he applies to them

the Pharisees and the scribes ask him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders,
 6. but eat their bread with ¹defiled hands? And he said unto them, Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written,

This people honoreth me with their lips,
 But their heart is far from me.

7. But in vain do they worship me,
 Teaching *as their* doctrines the precepts of men.
 8. Ye leave the commandment of God, and hold fast

¹ *common.*

Isaiah's denunciation of the hypocritical worshippers of his day—a denunciation which the prophet declares to be a word of God himself (Isa. 29 : 13). The passage in its latter part is here rendered after the LXX rather than the Hebrew, substituting for the Hebrew idea of fearing God only as they are directed by human commandment, the LXX idea of the uselessness of their worship, in view of the fact that it substitutes human commands for the law of God. **Full well:** This expression is not wholly ironical, since it points out the thoroughness with which they have substituted their own rules for the divine commands (cf. Jn. 4 : 17f.). This statement is substantiated by the following instance of what their position had brought them to do. Its significance is heightened by the fact that the divine command is taken from the Decalogue (Ex. 20 : 12), while its interpretation and the extreme penalty placed upon its transgression so interpreted (Ex. 21 : 17, cf. margin and Deut. 27 : 16) discloses the importance attached to it by the Mosaic Law. That this honoring of one's parents involved their support was not questioned by the Rabbis; but the support of the Temple worship was also a divine command, and they had established the rule that the Temple support should take precedence over parental support, in fact, a son, by simply declaring to his parents that the aid which they expected from him was **Corban** (transliteration of the Hebrew word, meaning *an offering, an oblation, i.e. a gift*, or, as the Revised Version phrases it, **given to God**), he would be released from the obligation of using it for their support, whether it was actually given to the Temple or not. The declaration did not necessarily dedicate it to the Temple; it simply removed it beyond the parents' reach (cf. Edersheim, *Life of Jesus*, II, pp. 19-21). And this was but one of many similar instances.

9. the tradition of men. And he said unto them, Full well do ye reject the commandment of God, that ye
 10. may keep your tradition. For Moses said, Honor thy father and thy mother; and, He that speaketh
 11. evil of father or mother, let him ¹ die the death: but ye say, If a man shall say to his father or his mother, That wherewith thou mightest have been profited
 12. by me is Corban, that is to say, Given *to God*; ye no longer suffer him to do aught for his father or his
 13. mother; making void the word of God by your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like
 14. things ye do. And he called to him the multitude again, and said unto them, Hear me all of you, and

¹ *surely die.*

They had practically made the moral law of God inoperative by placing the mechanical tradition of the elders in the supreme control of life.

14, 15. **And he called . . . the multitude again:** This implies a previous withdrawal of the multitude—doubtless merely a respectful drawing back at the formal approach of the Jerusalem delegation. It might seem strange that after the alienation of the people from Jesus there was still a multitude which gathered to his teaching; but we must remember that his discipleship did not fall away all at once. In fact, Jesus gave up his Galilean work rather because of the people's determined political attitude toward him than because of their abandonment of his cause. It, however, suggests the withdrawal of the delegation itself upon the conclusion of Jesus' reply; if so, it is quite likely that with the delegation there went away the element in the crowd which sided with the Pharisees rather than with Jesus; so that this is a calling around him of the element that sided with himself, as was done after the Beelzebul charge of the Jerusalem scribes (cf. 3 : 22f. and notes on vs. 31f.). In this case, as in that, he puts the truth before them in enigmatic form in order that they may be impelled to think upon it and, through the discovery of its meaning, be more deeply impressed by it. This is the significance of his call **Hear me . . . and understand** (cf. 4 : 12; 7 : 18; 8 : 17, 21). **Nothing . . . going into him . . . but the things which proceed out of the man . . . defile the man:** This is practically an interpretation

15. understand: there is nothing from without the man, that going into him can defile him; but the things which proceed out of the man are those that defile
 17. the man.¹ And when he was entered into the house from the multitude, his disciples asked of him the
 18. parable. And he saith unto them, Are ye so without understanding also? Perceive ye not, that whatsoever from without goeth into the man, *it* cannot defile him;
 19. because it goeth not into his heart, but into his belly, and goeth out into the draught? *This he said*, making

¹ Many MSS. insert ver. 16. *If any man hath ears to hear, let him hear.*

of the Law, in the sense of the statements of Matt. 5. The Law made clear distinctions between clean and unclean food (cf. Lev. 11), to which the requirement of hand washing before meals was simply an added Pharisaic ceremonial refinement. The vital matter, however, was the moral and not the ceremonial cleanness, and this was determined, not by the food which was eaten, much less by the formalities with which it was eaten, but by the expression of the inward character in the outward life.

It is to be noted that ver. 16 is omitted from the text, as being a later addition, and that Matthew (15: 3-14) not only changes the order of Jesus' reply, placing more logically the specific counter charge of the Pharisaic transgression of the Mosaic law (vs. 3-6) before the general denunciation of their hypocrisy (vs. 7-9), but prefaces the explanation to the disciples of the parabolic remark (ver. 10f.) with a statement of the critical stage to which the conflict between his spiritual ministry and Pharisaic ceremonialism had now come (vs. 12-14). This is likely to be a fuller and more accurate record of Jesus' remarks than that given us by Mark.

17-23. **So without understanding:** Even the sympathetic portion of the crowd might be expected to come slowly to a comprehension of the deeper truths of Jesus' teaching; but the disciples, whose sympathy of ideas was nourished by constant and intimate companionship, should have grasped the meaning involved in such a simple statement as he had made. The food which is eaten does not enter into the man's moral and religious life, but into his physical life, and is taken care of by its natural processes. **This he said, making all meats clean:** This is an interpretation of Jesus' words in the light of such controversies as arose in the Apostolic Age (cf. 1 Cor. 6: 12-

20. all meats clean. And he said, That which proceedeth
 21. out of the man, that defileth the man. For from
 within, out of the heart of men, ¹ evil thoughts pro-
 22. ceed, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covet-
 ings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye,
 23. railing, pride, foolishness: all these evil things proceed
 from within, and defile the man.

2. *Period of Retirement into the Regions of Tyre, Sidon and
 the Decapolis, 7 : 24-8 : 26*

24. And from thence he arose, and went away into the
 borders of Tyre ² and Sidon. And he entered into
 a house, and would have no man know it; and he

¹ Grk. *thoughts that are evil.*

² Some MSS. omit *and Sidon.*

20; ch. 8; 10 : 23-33; Rom. ch. 14; cf. also Acts 10 : 15). **Covetings**—not to be confined to specific infractions of the Tenth Commandment, but extending to all the impulses of grasping self-seeking. **Wickednesses**—not bad deeds in general, but acts of distinctively purposed evil—malicious wickedness (cf. Matt. 22 : 18). **Lasciviousness**—as distinguished from the particular sins of adultery and fornication, in the preceding verse, refers to the general conduct of a dissolute life (cf. Rom. 13 : 13). **An evil eye**—more than mere envy; rather the complement of the covetous self-seeking mentioned above—the greed that seeks not only to have more than is right from others, but begrudges what is right for them to have (cf. Deut. 15 : 9; Matt. 20 : 15; Jas. 5 : 4). **Railing**—slander, detraction (cf. 3 : 28f with Matt. 12 : 32). **Pride**—in its arrogance, as was specifically seen in the Pharisaic character (cf. Matt. 23 : 5-7, 12). **Foolishness**—not intellectual, but moral obtuseness (cf. Lk. 12 : 20). It will be seen that Matthew's list is much shorter than Mark's, and in its summing up (Matt. 15 : 20) affords another evidence of having given us altogether more accurately the Master's remarks; in fact, when we compare Mark's list with those in Gal. 5 : 19-21; Rom. 1 : 29-31; Eph. 4 : 19, 31; 5 : 3f., we cannot escape the feeling that it was influenced by the sins with which the Apostolic Church in its Gentile mission was confronted and compelled to denounce.

24. **He arose and went away:** The external reason for this retirement lay in the fact that the populace having turned away from

25. could not be hid. But straightway a woman, whose little daughter had an unclean spirit, having heard of
 26. him, came and fell down at his feet. Now the woman was a ¹ Greek, a Syrophœnician by race. And she besought him that he would cast forth the demon out of
 27. her daughter. And he said unto her, Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children's
 28. ² bread and cast it to the dogs. But she answered and saith unto him, Yea, Lord; even the dogs under

¹ Gentile, or pagan.² loaf.

him after his spiritual discourse on the Bread of Life, and the religious leaders having been alienated, as they had not been before, by his denunciation of ceremonialism as a regulative principle in everyday life (see notes on ver. 3f.), there was nothing left for him to do in the field of his former work. The deeper reason, however, lay in the gravity of the crisis with which his ministry was thus confronted and which called, not merely for serious reflection as to his personal future, but for an intimate instruction of his disciples, in preparation for the future, as it concerned their relations to himself. In view of this, something more was needed than a mere withdrawal across the Lake for rest (cf. 6 : 31), and something quite different from a transfer of his active ministry into a less Jewish region. This was essentially a period of retirement, and such works as were performed during it can be rightly understood only when they are seen practically to have been forced upon him in spite of his purpose to withdraw from all activity. The following statement that **he entered into a house and would have no man know** it gives essentially his intention for the entire period, the significant character of which is all the more evident when we realize that it was immediately preceded by the visit to Jerusalem recorded in the fifth chapter of John (cf. *Standard Bible Dictionary*, p. 438, Note 1).

(1) *The Syrophœnician Woman, vs. 25-30*

25-30. **Having heard of him**—not necessarily for the first time. People from this adjoining land had been attendant upon his ministry before the choosing of the Twelve (3 : 8). Indeed, the specifically Jewish appeal of the woman—"Thou Son of David"—as given in Matthew (15 : 22), who, in this incident, reproduces more reliably the Master's words—may have been due to the fact that at the close of the second preaching tour the cure of the Blind and Dumb De-

29. the table eat of the children's crumbs. And he said unto her, For this saying go thy way; the demon is gone out of thy daughter. And she went away unto her house, and found the child laid upon the bed, and the demon gone out.

moniac was recognized by the populace as attesting Jesus to be the Son of David (Matt. 12 : 23). This would not necessarily mean that the woman had accepted the Jewish Messianic hope, or that she had a religious faith in Jesus as the Messiah (cf. case of the Samaritan woman); but that she adopted the title bestowed upon him by his countrymen as a way of approach to him in her need, in faith that he had the power to meet the need (cf. Matt. 15 : 31 for the general Gentile attitude of mind toward the religious faiths of Judaism). **A Greek** by speech, but **a Syrophœnician by race**: In other words, while she spoke the language of common intercourse in the East, she belonged to that branch of the old Phœnician race which, migrating from the East, had settled along the coast and in Hellenistic times was called Syrian, in distinction from the Libyan branch in North Africa. The Phœnicians were an offshoot of the Semitic race, belonging to the Canaanites of the Old Testament. Matthew calls her "a Canaanitish woman" (15 : 22). **Cast forth the demon**—not necessarily at a distance by word of mouth, but most probably by accompanying her to her house and placing his hands upon the sufferer. This was the usual mode (cf. 5 : 23; 6 : 5). **Let the children first be fed**: According to Matthew's fuller record (15 : 23-26), he at first took no notice of the woman's plea, and when the disciples apparently urged him to grant it, so that she would stop crying after them, he laid their appeal aside with the reminder that he was sent distinctively to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; it was only when she persisted in a worshipful hope in his mercy that he replied to her at all, and then merely to say—as Mark also tells us in the following verse—that the children of the Covenant household should not have their rights taken from them and given to others. It is clear from these details that he had not gone into this region to continue his active ministry among a non-Jewish population as a promise of the final giving of the Gospel to the Gentiles. His personal ministry was to God's people in Israel. It was distinctively the work of the Messiah and would not be accomplished until the Jewish people had acted upon it as such. From the first, doubtless, there was involved in Jesus' insight into the hostility of the religious leaders to his spiritual claims, a consciousness, not only of the inevitable rejection of himself and his mission, but of the ultimate acceptance of his mis-

31. And again he went out from the borders of Tyre, and came through Sidon unto the sea of Galilee,
32. through the midst of the borders of Decapolis. And

sion and himself by those outside of Israel (cf. Lk. 4 : 16-30; Matt. 8 : 11f.). But this was not the time for the offer, and in so far as a ministry in this Gentile region would commit him to such an offer, his purpose was not to engage in it (cf. Matt. 10 : 5). That he yielded here to this woman's plea was due to the presence in it of a genuine faith which could not be denied. **Dogs** (Gr. *little dogs*)—evidently the household dogs, which were fed from their master's table (cf. following verse and Homer, II, 22 : 69; 23 : 173; Od. 17 : 309). This softened the reproach of the reply, though it made no less clear Jesus' attitude of mind in his ministry and his purpose in this withdrawal from Galilee. **Yea, Lord; even (better, and yet) the dogs . . . eat of the children's crumbs:** She admits the principle which he asserts, but turns it to her own advantage by proclaiming, not so much her willingness to take whatever might be left to her from the service of the children, but her desperate need, which would not be turned aside by any humiliation of racial pride, and which in this self-abnegating persistence of its struggle disclosed a trust in Jesus' power to heal and a confidence in his willingness to exert his power. **For this saying**—not, of course, for the saying itself, but for the faith involved in it.

(2) *The Deaf and Dumb Man, vs. 31-37*

31. **He went out from the borders of Tyre:** Having come out of Galilee for retirement, the performance of this miracle with the inevitable gathering of the populace around him determined Jesus to leave the neighborhood of Tyre for other regions further removed from the border and therefore more likely to give him the settled retirement he needed. Apparently, he first went northward and then, passing on his way through **Sidon**, turned towards the East and South and came into the more sparsely settled portions of the **Decapolis** (a region mostly East of the Jordan, dominated by ten independent cities, extending from Damascus, on the North to Philadelphia, on the South, and from Kanata, on the East to Scythopolis, on the West), returning later to the **Sea of Galilee**. It was impossible, however, to escape the crowds. They followed him from place to place carrying with them their sick, whom they cast down at his feet for healing (cf. Matt. 15 : 30f.). Of these healings and their results, Mark gives us an instance in the following verses.

32-37. **An impediment in his speech** (Gr. *speaking with difficulty*)—apparently an impairment in utterance which rendered him

they bring unto him one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech; and they beseech him to
 33. lay his hand upon him. And he took him aside from the multitude privately, and put his fingers into his
 34. ears, and he spat, and touched his tongue; and looking up to heaven, he sighed, and saith unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened. And his ears were opened,
 35. and the bond of his tongue was loosed, and he spake

practically unable to communicate his ideas through speech (cf. ver. 35), so that he is classed among the dumb (cf. ver. 37). **Privately** (lit. *apart, by himself*, cf. 6 : 31f.). The drawing of the man aside from the crowd was, not merely to enable him to concentrate his attention on what was being done for him, but to avoid any unnecessary publicity in the healing. This and the similar case of the blind man at Bethsaida (8 : 22-26) afford additional evidence that in his withdrawal from Galilee the Master's purpose was not to continue his active ministry among a non-Jewish people. He engaged in no public teaching. His activity was confined, apparently, to isolated cases of healing, concluding with a feeding of the multitude, and, throughout the journey, whatever he does seems to have the character of something the doing of which he could not escape (cf. vs. 24-26, 32; 8 : 2f.). **Put his fingers into his ears . . . touched his tongue:** The unusual actions employed by the Master, especially when compared with the similar actions in the case of the blind man in this same Decapoltan region (8 : 23), seem to have been determined by the religiously ignorant character of the populace. In a specific way they directed attention to the cure which was to be made, and to this degree helped the patient to an exercise of a definite trust in him who was effecting it. The employment of spittle was in accordance with its recognized use as a remedial agent, and thus contributed to the patient's confidence. It was not necessarily applied directly to his tongue, but most probably first to the Master's fingers. It seems to have been otherwise in the case of the Bethsaida blind man (8 : 23; cf. however, the detailed description of the action in the case of the Jerusalem blind man, Jn. 9 : 6). **Sighed:** The heavenward glance and the deep-drawn sigh were not symbolic encouragements to the patient's faith, but personal expressions of the Master's own consciousness of the source of the healing power and the cause of this, as of all maladies to be cured. His perfect communion with God gave him a profound sense of the ravages of sin over the physical, as well as the spiritual world. Burdened as he always was with this

36. plain. And he charged them that they should tell no man: but the more he charged them, so much the
 37. more a great deal they published it. And they were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well; he maketh even the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak.

8. In those days, when there was again a great multitude, and they had nothing to eat, he called unto

fact of sin, it was not unnatural that he should give expression to the consciousness of its presence, particularly where it had forced itself into the friendships of life, as in the case of Lazarus (Jn. 11 : 41), and into the worship and service of the covenant people, as in his lament over Jerusalem (Lk. 13 : 34; 19 : 41), and here in the case of this heathen where it showed its sway over the world which was so ignorant of God. **Ephphatha**—assimilated from the Aramaic expression (*Ethpathach*), used doubtless by the Master and preserved for us by Mark from the Apostolic recitals of the incident (cf. 5 : 41; 14 : 36). It is addressed to the ears, as the organs principally affected. **Plainly** (Gr. *straight, rightly*)—showing that he had not been entirely dumb, but only inarticulate in his speech. **Charged them**—not only the patient, but his friends (cf. ver. 32), in order that no publicity might be given to the cure and his purpose of retirement be further hindered. But the command, though apparently repeatedly given, was ineffectual; for the more he charged them, so much the more . . . they published it, and accompanied their excited proclamation with an astonished testimony to his power and the excellence of his deeds—a result very different from that which followed Jesus' previous miracle in this region (5 : 15-17).

(3) *The Feeding of the Four Thousand, vs. 1-9*

8 : 1-9. **In those days**—not a vague expression of time, indicating an uncertainty as to when the event took place, but a general term used, as in 1 : 9, to connect the following incident somewhat loosely with the foregoing narrative. It is obvious that the gathering of such a multitude in the Master's following is a perfectly natural development of the preceding incidents—not that the events were in themselves of extraordinary character, but that the region was inhabited by a people to whom such things were wholly new and of superstitious excitement, and who, in spite of all the Master's efforts to restrain them, had enthusiastically heralded far and wide his fame as a wonder worker. In the thinly settled portions of the

2. him his disciples, and saith unto them, I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with
3. me now three days, and have nothing to eat: and if I send them away fasting to their homes, they will faint on the way; and some of them are come from far.
4. And his disciples answered him, Whence shall one be able to fill these men with ¹ bread here in a desert

¹ Grk. *loaves*.

Decapolis, such need as is described in ver. 2 would easily occur, and as it grew would make more certain the attachment of the crowd to him they followed, as their only likely source of relief. At the first, the Master had doubtless hoped that the people naturally, as the way grew hard and food more scarce to get, would disperse of themselves; but as he found the days increasing and his course drawing near again to the Sea of Galilee and coming thus out into more populated regions, he realized that, not only for the sake of the multitude, but for his own sake, this following must be relieved of its need, and sent back to the country from which it had come. His **compassion** is for the people's lack of food; at the first feeding it had been for their lack of right religious leadership. This is a difference in the Master's attitude of mind towards the situation which agrees significantly with the fact that on the former occasion the multitude had been made up of Jews, whose spiritual condition had been neglected by their religious leaders; here it was composed of Gentiles, with regard to whom this point would not arise (see notes on 6 : 34). **Whence . . . fill these men with bread?** It seems at first sight unaccountable that the disciples should not have recalled the previous feeding in this same general region, and answered the Master's question with a challenge to him to repeat his wonder work. At the same time, we must remember (1) that the disciples had not been much impressed with that miracle of the first feeding, as far as it showed the Master's care for them; for a few hours later, on the Lake, the thought of this care was the last thing in their minds (cf. 6 : 49-52; (2) that we must not fail to consider the impression made upon the disciples by the collapse of the Master's work and his forced retirement from Jewish regions. The statement after the address which precipitated that collapse, "To whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life" (Jn. 6 : 68), was not so much a confession of confidence as a confused mixture of loyalty to him and depression of mind as to the popular revulsion of feeling against him. This confusion must have grown with the Pentecost visit to Jerusalem (Jn. 5 : 1),

5. place? And he asked them, How many loaves have
6. ye? And they said, Seven. And he commandeth the multitude to sit down on the ground: and he took the seven loaves, and having given thanks, he brake, and gave to his disciples, to set before them; and they
7. set them before the multitude. And they had a few small fishes: and having blessed them, he commanded
8. to set these also before them. And they ate, and were filled: and they took up, of broken pieces that remained

and was certainly not relieved by the subsequent necessity of leaving their own land and the wandering journey through these heathen regions. Here, at the end of this apparently aimless tour, they stand confronted with a hungry heathen multitude in a desert place, and the Master himself has nothing definite to propose for their relief. It is hardly reasonable to expect them to be more ready to think of his ability to provide against this emergency than they were later when he warned them against the leaven of the Pharisees (ver. 15), and they were thrown into consternation about their lack of food, without a thought of his power to supply their need. **Seven**—as against five at the first feeding. **A few small fishes**—as against two fishes at the former time. It is to be noted that here he blesses the fishes, as well as the bread. The strict Jewish custom of blessing only the bread seems to have been confined to the first occasion, with its Jewish multitude. **Seven baskets**—of a soft quality, made of plaited reeds or cords, sometimes of large size, as in the case of Saul's escape from Damascus (Acts 9 : 25). At the former feeding the baskets were twelve in number, and of stout wickerwork. **About four thousand**—as against five thousand on the former occasion. There is thus a varied difference in these details; at some points the figures are higher at the second feeding, at others lower, the incident having the appearance of a natural occurrence, and not of a literary restatement of the former event. **Dalmanutha**: This is a wholly unidentified locality. Matthew has "Magadan" (15 : 39). If this is the same as Magdala, then it was on the Western shore of the Lake, some seven miles South of Gennesaret, and ver. 13 is consistently a return to the Eastern side, bringing them to Bethsaida (ver. 22). In any event, Mark's record places this feeding near the Lake, which the crowd could not cross with their new found leader, making the situation thus one in which the Master found himself compelled to consider the sending of the people back to their homes.

9. over, seven baskets. And they were about four
 10. thousand: and he sent them away. And straightway
 he entered into the boat with his disciples, and came
 into the parts of Dalmanutha.
 11. And the Pharisees came forth, and began to ques-
 tion with him, seeking of him a sign from heaven,

(4) *The Pharisees' Request for a Sign, vs. 10-13*

10-13. **The Pharisees came forth** to meet him, as he came again to the Western side of the Lake, and began to enter into a discussion with him, **seeking of him a sign from heaven**. Their motive in seeking a sign was not what it was at the casting out of the dumb and blind demoniac—to belittle his miraculous power—but for the purpose of **trying him**, entrapping him into a further unpopularity with his already alienated following. Their action is thus based upon the defection of the people from him, and the sign for which they ask has reference to the coming kingdom, the nearness of which had been the specific announcement of the last preaching tour (see notes on 6 : 7). The suggestion of such a request came, doubtless, from the signs announced in the book of the prophet Joel (2 : 30f.), as harbingers of the Messianic Kingdom; and their hope was that he would be led into some definition or designation or description of that kingdom which would heighten the already unpopular idea of its spiritual character (cf. Jn. 6 : 60-63). Their request is in line with their later and more definite question: "When shall the kingdom of God come?" (Lk. 17 : 20; cf. also the disciples' question, Mk. 13 : 3f. and the Master's reply, vs. 24-29, and Peter's sermon, Acts 2 : 14-21). This would be all the more evident if Matthew's elaboration of Jesus' reply (16 : 2b, 3) were part of the text; though even its interpolation shows the early understanding as to what the Pharisees sought in their request (cf. Lk. 12 : 54-56, where this statement occurs in a chapter which begins with a warning against the leaven of the Pharisees). **He sighed deeply in his spirit**—expressive of the burden which rested on his soul through his profound realization of the significance of their wilful and persistent hostility to his message of truth. **There shall no sign be given:** According to Mark, Jesus refuses to grant their request. Matthew less accurately intimates that he refers them to the sign of the prophet Jonah, as in the request after the casting out of the demoniac (Matt. 12 : 38-41). The reason for his refusal was doubtless because he did not feel the time had come for it; since later, on the way to Jerusalem, he does not hesitate to lay before them a statement as to the spiritual

12. trying him. And he sighed deeply in his spirit, and saith, Why doth this generation seek a sign? verily I say unto you, There shall no sign be given unto this
13. generation. And he left them, and again entering into *the boat* departed to the other side.
14. And they forgot to take bread; and they had not
15. in the boat with them more than one loaf. And he charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven
16. of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod. And they reasoned one with another, ¹ saying, ² We have no

¹ Some MSS. read *because they had no bread.*

² *It is because we have no bread.*

character of the coming of the kingdom (Lk. 17 : 20f.). **To the other side:** This immediate return to the Eastern side of the Lake shows that he must have come over from it in order to get free of the enthusiastic multitude which had been swept into his following by the kindly miracles he had been forced to do; since a mere request from the Pharisees for a sign would not have forced him back into the wilderness regions if his primary object in going there had been accomplished. As a matter of fact, however, it had not been accomplished. He had not been able to get the retirement for which he sought; so, on his return, he does not go Northward, as before, but in a northeasterly direction into the most sparsely settled portion of Philip's tetrarchy (vs. 22, 27).

(5) *The Warning against the Leaven of the Pharisees, vs. 14-21*

14-21. They forgot to take bread: What had occasioned this forgetfulness, we are not told. It may have been the immediacy of their return, confused as it must have been by the controversy which had preceded it. **The leaven of the Pharisees and . . . of Herod:** Leaven here is not what Matthew makes it—"the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (16 : 12); it is rather the attitude of mind, the spirit, which rendered the Pharisees, from their religious point of view, and Herod, from his political point of view, hostile to him and set against him. Jesus had become more clearly and deeply conscious of the spirit of these two forces since the last preaching tour, from which his disciples had brought him reports as to Herod's attitude of mind (6 : 14-16), and since his visit to Jerusalem at the last Feast of Pentecost, where he had seen the murderous anger of which the religious leaders were capable (Jn. 5 : 17f.). It is against

17. bread. And Jesus perceiving it saith unto them, Why reason ye, because ye have no bread? do ye not yet perceive, neither understand? have ye your heart
 18. hardened? Having eyes, see ye not? and having ears,
 19. hear ye not? and do ye not remember? When I brake the five loaves among the five thousand, how many baskets full of broken pieces took ye up? They

this spirit of the Pharisees and of Herod that he puts the disciples on their guard. His warning is thus a preliminary note to the instruction which he feels now more than ever is a vital necessity for the slow-minded and still nationally hopeful disciples. (See the persistency of their national ideas in the question of Acts 1 : 6.) The warning may have been occasioned by the discovery that they had with them but a single loaf of bread, and the conversation among themselves which would naturally follow; but the reason for it was their failure to appreciate the significance of the request for a sign and his refusal of it. The encounter with the Pharisees may have confused them into forgetting to take with them sufficient provision, but it had not opened to their minds what it portended for the future. They were disturbed by it as showing the persistent unreceptivity of the Pharisees to their Master's teaching and work; but they had no conception of what this involved of the hopeless set of the will against all that this teaching and work stood for and represented. So they had failed to grasp the significance of the incident, and were now concerned merely with the fact that they had not enough food. Jesus will, therefore, draw them back to the real and vital thing which should occupy their minds—the accumulating signs of the times, as bearing upon his Ministry and his own life. He lets the bread of which they are doubtless talking suggest his phrase of leaven, and so seeks to direct their attention to the religious and political forces which are gathering against himself and his work. **They reasoned . . . we have no bread:** This warning against the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod could not have suggested to them as Orientals so concrete a thing as bread, unless they were unnaturally occupied with the thought of their lack of food and had wholly failed to understand the real significance of the Pharisees' request for a sign. The first idea that an Oriental would have had of leaven as related to persons was the moving and controlling spirit of life and action (as Jesus himself thought of it (cf. Lk. 12 : 1; 13 : 21); that they limited it to the physical idea of bread shows how far they were from realizing the spiritual things with which their Master's ministry was con-

20. say unto him, Twelve. And when the seven among the four thousand, how many basketfuls of broken pieces took ye up? And they say unto him, Seven.
21. And he said unto them, Do ye not yet understand?
22. And they come unto Bethsaida. And they bring

cerned, and how much in need they were of the instruction which he was planning to give them. **Do ye not yet perceive, neither understand?** This rebuking inquiry does not refer to the disciples' failure to perceive and understand what was meant by the leaven, but to the lack of confidence in his ability to provide for their physical needs, which was evidently involved in their interpretation of this expression (see vs. 19-21). Apparently, they understood his warning to be against supplying their shortage by the purchase of some sort of undesirable food. But why should they think that the Master was in any way concerned about their provision of food, when they had so well in memory the recent feedings of the multitude? Did they not understand that when he warned them against the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod that he had in mind something which affected them far more personally than the provision of bread? It is clear that we have here—just as really as in the case of the second feeding—a hopeless state of mind on the disciples' part as to the ability of the Master to provide against an emergency in their supply of food. Apparently, the second miracle had left no greater impression upon them than the first, and it is not hard to understand the Master's disappointment, not so much at their inability to grasp the meaning of his words, as at their failure, after all his companionship with them and all his varied ministries to them, to have a confidence in his care for them. If they were to be prepared against the coming catastrophe in his work and life, it was essential that they should trust him with the supremest questions of the religious life, and here even a confidence in his care for them in ordinary physical things was lacking. It is to be noted that the words for "baskets" in vs. 19 and 20 agree with the different words used in the narratives of the two feedings (see notes on v. 8).

(6) *The Healing of the Bethsaida Blind Man, vs. 22-26*

22-26. **Bethsaida:** For the identity of this place, see notes on 6:45. **Took hold . . . by the hand . . . and brought him out of the village:** For the significance of this action, see notes on 7:33. The Master was returning to the sparsely settled regions on the

- to him a blind man, and beseech him to touch him.
23. And he took hold of the blind man by the hand, and brought him out of the village; and when he had spit on his eyes, and laid his hands upon him, he asked
24. him, Seest thou aught? And he looked up, and said, I see men; for I behold *them* as trees, walking.
25. Then again he laid his hands upon his eyes; and he looked stedfastly, and was restored, and saw
26. all things clearly. And he sent him away to his home, saying, Do not even enter into the village.

East, with an even greater sense of the need of retirement for himself and his disciples than he had had at his first retirement (see notes on 7 : 24); so that his effort at privacy in this case of healing was more elaborate than in the case of the man who was deaf and impotent in his speech. **Spit on his eyes:** Apparently, the saliva was thrown directly on the sightless organs. (But see notes on 7 : 33.) **Laid his hands upon him**—upon his eyes, as is evident from ver. 25. **Seest thou aught?** This question is part of the process of gradual healing which the Master adopted in this case, in order to help the religiously slow-moving Gentile mind to an adequate faith in what he was doing. **I behold them as trees, walking:** The man had not been born blind. He knew how men looked, and he knew that he was not seeing them as they really were—in size and general outline, the objects he saw were like small trees; in action they were like men. **Looked stedfastly** (lit. *to see through, to see clearly*, as in Matt. 7 : 5): The Revisers have confused the meaning of the latter part of this verse. What Mark wishes to say is that, after the second touch of the Master's hands, the man saw—no longer with a confused vision, but clearly, so that his sight was fully restored and he was able to look at all things (not he **saw**), even though they were far away (not **clearly**). **To his home**—from which he had come to Bethsaida, under the guiding of companions. Possibly, he may have been brought there by them specifically to secure Jesus' help, as the news of his presence again at the Lake had been spread abroad, through such an event as the second feeding of the multitude, which, occurring as it did, in this same general region East of the Lake, could not have remained an isolated and unknown event. **Do not even enter**—final evidence of the Master's anxiety that the news of such healings as he was compelled to perform be not spread abroad and his further effort at retirement be frustrated.

3. *The Work of Instruction, 8 : 27-10 : 52*(A) *In the Decapolis*

27. And Jesus went forth, and his disciples, into the villages of Cæsarea Philippi: and on the way he asked his disciples, saying unto them, Who do men say that

(1) *The Disciples' Confession of Jesus' Messiahship, 8 : 27-9 : 1*

27. Went forth . . . into the villages of Cæsarea Philippi—a city in the tetrachy of Philip, located in one of the recesses of Hermon, near the sources of the Jordan. Its earlier name was Paneas (Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII : 2 : 1), derived from a grotto dedicated to Pan (*Antiq.* XV : 10 : 3). Philip enlarged and refounded the older city, calling it Cæsarea, in honor of Augustus (Josephus, *War*, II : 9 : 1), and adding his own name, to distinguish it from the Cæsarea, founded by his Father on the coast (*War*, III : 9 : 7). The course followed by Jesus and his disciples from Bethsaida was most probably up the Jordan Valley. The distance was only some twenty-five miles; but it is not likely, with the retirement which he sought for reflection and for an intimate instruction of his disciples, that this was covered in any but a most leisurely way. Now, however, as he approaches the villages suburban to Cæsarea, he seems to have felt that his purpose was accomplished, and he puts to them the questions, the answer to which will show with what success the instruction had been carried on. **Who do men say that I am?** This was preliminary to the vital question of ver. 29, and, together with it, discloses the character of the instruction he had given them—a deeper and more vital acquainting of them with the spiritual nature of his work and of himself. It would seem from the warning with which the incident of the heaven opened (ver. 15) as though he had intended to employ this time of seclusion in acquainting them with what was to come upon his work and himself through the hostility of his enemies, but it would seem from the rebuke with which the incident closed, that, owing to the alarming disclosure, not only of their lack of spiritual insight into his teaching, but of their lack of practical confidence in himself, he had abandoned that subject for this other, as being more essential. The only way he could secure, as, in fact, the only way he did secure, in them an endurance of the coming catastrophe, was by bringing them into a vitally spiritual fellowship with himself. The question he put to them at the close of the Capernaum address shows that he was not sure whether their national ideas would let them accept the spiritual nature of his

28. I am? And they told him, saying, John the Baptist; and others, Elijah; but others, One of the prophets.
29. And he asked them, But who say ye that I am? Peter answereth and saith unto him, Thou art the Christ.

work (Jn. 6 : 67)—just as he had hurried them away from the nationally enthusiastic crowd after the first feeding, lest they be caught in the political hysteria (see notes on 6 : 45). But now through this period of retirement, he had sought to bring them to a spiritual understanding of his work and of himself. If they were to endure through the coming disaster in an abiding confidence in himself, this was the basis for all that he would have to disclose to them of what that disaster was to be. The startling way in which the later announcement of the Passion came to the disciples shows that it could not have been the subject of his instruction to them during this time.

28. **John the Baptist . . . Elijah . . . One of the prophets:** This shows that the same ideas were current among the people as during the last Preaching Tour (cf. 6 : 14f.). At that time, this was all the people thought him to be, and though, after the Feeding of the Five Thousand, the multitude was ready to make him the Messianic King, his determination not to permit this to be and his refusal in the Capernaum address to give a sign of his Messiahship brought the people back to these same ideas of him, and they were confirmed in them by the fact that, since the address in Capernaum, the Passover had taken place and Jesus had not been present at the Feast with any claims at all. Naturally, the people said he might be a prophet, but he was not the Messiah—at least not the Messiah for whom they looked. Consequently, the disciples' confession of the Messiahship here becomes natural and normal only in view of the instruction given them by the Master—as it is not after the Walking on the Water (Matt. 14 : 33) and after the address on the Bread of Life (Jn. 6 : 69) and yet the confession, when it came, was an inference by the disciples from the spiritual character of his work and of his own relation to God which he had been disclosing to them in this instruction.

29. **Who say ye that I am?** The significance of this question rested in the fact that the disciples might have come to realize this spiritual character of his work and his relation to God and yet have hesitated to say he was the Messiah; for this very spiritual character of what he was and of what he did was so contrary to National Judaism that to confess him to be the Messiah meant a vital break with all the religion they had known. They had recognized his wonderful goodness to the needs of men; they had come through this instruction to understand his fellowship with themselves in the needs of

30. And he charged them that they should tell no man of him.
31. And he began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed,

their own hearts; they had even begun to see something of his spiritual relations with God—but all these things might be and yet he be only a supreme teacher—a holy prophet come from God. To confess that he was the National Messiah was to hold themselves Jews and at the same time to break with all they knew of Judaism. Yet the spiritual impress of the Master upon their souls, gathered up and intensified during this period of instruction, had been irresistible, and when this challenge came to them, they cast all their hopes and expectations into the overflowing loyalty of Peter's answer, **Thou art the Christ**. Matthew's addition (16:17-19) commends itself as naturally a part of this incident; for the Master's unrestrained approval is what we would expect, in view of the critical nature of the situation; while his reference to the Church which was to grow out of this confession accords with the rupture from National Judaism which the confession involved, and his reference to the confession itself as brought about by divine revelation presupposes this very spiritual instruction which he had been carrying on during this period. (See Garvie, *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*, pp. 245-247.)

30. **Tell no man of him:** Though the Twelve were convinced of his spiritual Messiahship and had asserted their belief, even at the cost of breaking with National Judaism, they were in no condition to instruct and persuade the multitude who had already deliberately and even passionately rejected this idea.

31. **Began to teach them**—as part of his instruction, made possible now that they had come to the confession of the spiritual nature of his Messianic work, and at the same time most necessary; since, being Jews, the thought of suffering was just as foreign to their conception of his spiritual Messiahship as it had been to all their previous idea of himself and his work. **The Son of Man:** Possibly, this title was used instead of "the Christ" to minimize the resentment with which the announcement of suffering would be received. **The elders . . . chief priests . . . Scribes**—the three distinct classes of which the Sanhedrin was composed. If Jesus was to be rejected at all, it would have to be by the ecclesiastical rulers and not by the Pharisees as a party among the people, however much these rulers were under the influence of that Pharisaic ceremonialism with which his spiritual mission was so vitally in con-

32. and after three days rise again. And he spake the saying openly. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him. But he turning about, and seeing his

flict. This he had known, in a way, from the beginning of his ministry (see notes on 2 : 12, 19; cf. also Jn. 2 : 19), but he had realized it with convincing force in his recent visit to Jerusalem at Pentecost (cf. Jn. 5 : 16-18; 7 : 19-24). **Be killed:** There is no reference here to the kind of death he was to die. Like the earlier statement of the end awaiting him (2 : 20; Mt. 12 : 40; Jn. 2 : 19), it is general and is not defined by the details which may have become evident to him only at the last. **After three days rise again:** The inclusion of this reference to the resurrection in the announcement of his Passion must have been due to his consciousness of his vital relationship to the ever living God. There was nothing in the attitude of the people or of the rulers to suggest this to him now, any more than there had been at the beginning of his ministry (cf. Jn. 2 : 19), or during its progress (cf. Matt. 12 : 40). This Markan phrase, "after three days" (*i.e. in a short time*)—also used in 9 : 31; 10 : 34—is on the face of it primary as over against the more formal phrase, "on the third day," used by Matthew and Luke (cf. also Acts 10 : 40; 1 Cor. 15 : 4).

32. **Openly** (lit. *unreservedly, plainly, i.e. in unmistakable terms*, as against his earlier enigmatic references to the event, cf. 2 : 20; Jn. 2 : 19; 3 : 14f.; 6 : 51-56; Matt. 12 : 40). **Took him**—aside, from the rest of the Twelve, as though privately to remonstrate with him against such an impossible idea. **To rebuke him:** The disciples' acceptance of the spiritual character of the Master's work was at most a change from a political to a spiritual conception of what he was to do for Judaism and, through Judaism, for the world. Neither Nationalism nor Ceremonialism was wholly gone from their Messianic ideas (cf. Acts 1 : 6; 10 : 9-16; Gal. 2 : 11-14); while the suffering of the Messiah was completely at variance with them. As they saw it, the Messiah must triumph spiritually, if not politically, and spiritual triumph did not involve in its processes, any more than in its results, the element of suffering. Consequently, when this announcement of the Passion was made, the statement of the Death overwhelmed and put out of thought the statement of the Resurrection (cf. Jn. 20 : 1-9; Lk. 24 : 10-12). The passionate emotion of Peter's resentment is more clearly preserved in Matthew's record: "Be it far from thee (lit. *God have mercy on thee*), Lord: this shall never be unto thee" (16 : 22f.).

33. **Satan**—not as giving Peter an evil name, as he had just before given him a noble one (Matt. 16 : 18), but as recognizing the

- disciples, rebuked Peter, and saith, Get thee behind me, Satan; for thou mindest not the things of God,
 34. but the things of men. And he called unto him the multitude with his disciples, and said unto them, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself,
 35. and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it.

Satanic element of temptation in Peter's remonstrance against the course to which he had committed himself. **Mindest not** (lit. *thinkest not, regardest not*) **the things of God**: Peter did not look at things as God looked at them. This was the fundamental difficulty. Consequently, he could see no reason why such a death should enter into the Master's future course; he could not appreciate nor understand the element of self-sacrifice in the work of the Messiah. He looked at things as men looked at them, from the viewpoint of self-interest and self-regard, so that the Master's statement was to him the announcement of an impossible course of action for any one to take, whether Messiah or not.

34-9 : 1. **The multitude**: The presence of a crowd which required any such instruction as is contained in the following discourse is so out of keeping with the surroundings in which Jesus and his disciples find themselves that we can only think, either of these words as having been delivered at some other time, as for example on the way to Jerusalem in some such circumstances as are indicated by Luke for similar remarks (12 : 4-21; or 14 : 25-27; or 17 : 20-37), or—which is more probable—of Matthew's record as being primary and the discourse as having been delivered at this time specifically to the disciples (Matt. 16 : 24). In view of the fact that the disciples did not understand the need of suffering in connection with the spiritual ministry of the Messiah, it would seem only natural that he should follow up his rebuke of Peter with an enlargement upon the idea of the necessity of suffering for the disciples as well as for himself. **Take up his cross**: This figure is not used by the Master with any specific reference to the mode of his coming death. The process of crucifixion, by which the condemned criminal carried on his shoulders the instrument of his execution, was a matter of common knowledge, and reference is made to it here in general, as indicating the limit to which the denying, *i.e.* the ignoring of oneself was to go—the limit of giving up life itself. **And** (lit. *and so*) **follow me**: This is not added as a third requirement, but as gathering up the condi-

36. For what doth it profit a man, to gain the whole world,
 37. and forfeit his life? For what should a man give in
 38. exchange for his life? For whosoever shall be ashamed
 of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful
 generation, the Son of man also shall be ashamed of
 him, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with
 the holy angels.

tional statement of the preceding verse and showing how it was fulfilled only by the ignoring of self. **Would save his life**—his physical life, by refusing to ignore himself to the limit of giving it up, even unto death. **Shall lose it**—the spiritual life—the life which comes from sacrificing the lower interests of one's physical and personal life for the higher and nobler interests that lie outside of it and are gathered up ideally in the service of God—or, as the Master puts it in the converse statement: **whosoever shall lose**—ignore, sacrifice—**his lower, physical, personal life for my sake and the Gospel's shall save it**. The peculiar Markan addition, "and the Gospel's," is most likely taken from the later form into which the Master's words had been cast in the Apostolic preaching (see notes on 1 : 4) or may be the work of an Editor, as in 10 : 29. **Gain the whole world and forfeit** (*i.e.* lose as a penalty) **his life**: The soul finds its life, not in having possessions, but in being in fellowship with God. Consequently, to absorb oneself in getting gain is to minister to the soul the things on which it cannot live. The penalty is the loss of its life (cf. Lk. 12 : 16-20; also Phil. 3 : 7f.; Matt. 4 : 8). **In exchange for his life**—after it is lost, in order to get it back. **For**—confirming the hopelessness of this loss of the soul's life by the attitude which Christ himself must take at the final consummation of his kingdom toward the spirit which prompted such living. **Ashamed of me and my words**—not simply lacking in moral courage to identify himself with Christ and his teaching, but without moral responsiveness towards his truth or personal responsiveness towards his self. **Adulterous**—the old prophetic phraseology for expressing apostasy from Jehovah (cf. Hos. 2 : 2-13; Ezek. 16 : 1-22). **Son of man . . . be ashamed**—not merely lacking in personal accord and fellowship with him, but expressing this in a positive disowning of all relations between him and himself (cf. Matt. 10 : 33 = Lk. 12 : 9). **Glory of his Father**: His triumph is to realize itself in the manifestation of the glory of the Divine presence, rather than in the display of the pomp of an earthly kingdom. **With the holy angels**—as ministers of his rule (cf. 13 : 27; 2 Thess. 1 : 7; Heb. 1 : 14). **See the king-**

9. And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There are some here of them that stand *by*, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power.
2. And after six days Jesus taketh with him Peter, and ¹ James, and John, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart by themselves: and he was trans-
3. figured before them; and his garments became glister-

¹ *Jacob.*

dom of God come with power: This cannot refer to the witness which three of the disciples had of the following transfiguration; though those who divided this Gospel into chapter and verse evidently so intended it to be understood by distinctly connecting the statement with the record of this event, in spite of their failure to do so in Matthew's Gospel (cf. Matt. 16 : 28). It refers to the coming of the kingdom in spiritual power, as it was established in the hearts of men throughout the Apostolic age. This would be in accord with the spiritual idea of himself and his mission which he had been bringing home to the disciples in his instruction. This spiritual coming of the kingdom is thus preparatory to that personal coming of the Son of Man referred to in the preceding verse, which marks the kingdom's consummation.

(2) *The Transfiguration, 9 : 2-13*

2, 3. **After six days**—Luke less definitely and accurately, "about eight days after" (cf. similar indefiniteness in Luke's statement of figures, 3 : 23; 9 : 14; 22 : 59). **Peter and James and John:** so far, these three disciples had been favored with a participation in the private experiences of the Master's ministry only at the raising of Jairus' daughter (5 : 37). **A high mountain**—one of the southern spurs of Hermon, in whose neighborhood they were (see notes on 8 : 27). **Apart by themselves:** In view of their need of further instruction as to his Passion and their own suffering as his disciples, it was quite natural that, before he should come again into the public work that must turn his face finally towards Jerusalem, he should wish to have close and intimate converse with them about the future. **Transfigured** (lit. *transformed*, cf. 2 Cor. 3 : 18): After the talk together, the Master doubtless drew apart for personal prayer (cf. Lk. 9 : 28), his mind filled with thoughts which, however burdened with the inevitable outcome of his earthly ministry, must have been

- ing, exceeding white, so as no fuller on earth can whiten
4. them. And there appeared unto them Elijah with
 5. Moses: and they were talking with Jesus. And Peter answereth and saith to Jesus, Rabbi, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah.
 6. For he knew not what to answer; for they became sore

dominated with his consciousness of vital communion with God, of his personal relation to the Unseen World, and of the final triumph of his work—the triumph of it, not as a Cause, but as the realization of his divine claims on the faith and obedience of humanity. He would thus be not only receptive to the coming of the heavenly visitants and their converse with him on the tragic events which lay before him (cf. Lk. 9 : 31), but would be filled anew with the glory of its results. This was the real transformation which took place and which must have shown itself essentially in the glorified transforming of his countenance (cf. Matt. 17 : 2; Lk. 9 : 29; cf. also Ex. 34 : 29; Acts 6 : 15). This all took place **before them**, *i.e.* in their full sight, and as they watched, it seemed as though the glory of his exultant inner self overflowed upon his very garments, until they **became glistering**—flashing like burnished brass, or steel (Nah. 3 : 3), or gold (1 Esdras 8 : 57), or like fire (1 Macc. 6 : 39). **Exceeding white**—Matthew says “white as the light”; Luke, “white and dazzling” (better *dazzling white*). **So as no fuller on earth can whiten them** (lit such [garments] as a fuller on the earth is not able so to whiten [them]).

4. **There appeared unto them:** This was as real an experience to the disciples as it was to the Master. Such foreboding thoughts as they had made them receptive to it, not in the way of a self-suggested dream—which would have been a gloomy and not a glorious one—but in appreciation of its offsetting of their fears for the future. **Elijah with Moses:** Elijah was in the thoughts of the people generally as one who was to return to earth as the herald of the Nation's Messiah. This conversation with the Master was not a rôle expected of him; while Moses was not looked for at all. As far, however, as they represented the Old Testament dispensation, their presence was an assurance to the disciples—as it was supremely to the Master—that whatever of suffering there might be in the future for him, the glory of the kingdom would not be lost, but would be identified with the glory of his personal life.

5, 6. **Answereth**—not to anything that had been said, but to what

7. afraid. And there came a cloud overshadowing them:
and there came a voice out of the cloud, This is my
8. beloved Son: hear ye him. And suddenly looking
round about, they saw no one any more, save Jesus
only with themselves.

had occurred. Luke adds that his remarks were made as the Heavenly Visitants were departing from them (9 : 33). **It is good for us to be here** (lit. *It is good that we are here*)—not in the sense of being pleasant for them, but opportune that they can be of service in the way he is about to suggest. **Tabernacles**—booths—doubtless, to retain the Visitants and, in the joyous spirit of the Feast of Tabernacles, to express the rapture aroused by their presence. It was a confused mixture of purpose, impulsively formed, and without rational adjustment to the situation; **for he knew not what to answer**. They had all become **sore afraid**: It was not only an unusual, but an unnatural experience which, by its very reality, dazed them and made it difficult for their minds to work in an orderly way.

7, 8. **A cloud**—the usual symbol of the Divine Presence in the Old Testament theophanies (cf. Ex. 16 : 10; 19 : 9, 16; 24 : 15f.; 33 : 9; Lev. 16 : 2; Num. 11 : 25). According to Matthew, it was “bright”; so that the fear which they experienced (cf. Lk. 9 : 34) when it came **overshadowing them** (the disciples as well as the Master and his Visitants) was not one of depression from the murky darkness of an enveloping mist, but one of awe from the unnatural brightness of an overflowing glory, like that which rested upon and filled the Tabernacle (Ex. 40 : 35; cf. also 2 Pet. 1 : 17). **A voice**—intended to express, in what it uttered, the Divine approval of Jesus’ renewed commitment of himself to his work in face of the tragic development which it presented. So had Jesus’ initial commitment of himself to his work been approved at the Baptism (see notes on 1 : 11). **My beloved Son**: Mark and Matthew reproduce the title as given at the Baptism: Luke changes it to “chosen” (cf. Isa. 42 : 1). None of them add the Baptism phrase, “in whom I am well pleased” (which, however, is given in 2 Pet. 1 : 17); instead, they unite in recording an altogether different phrase as having been uttered, **hear ye him**. This was in keeping with the presence of Moses, who had foretold of a prophet God was to raise up, to whom they were to hearken (Deut. 18 : 15, 18f.). This prophet was identified with the Messiah (cf. Jn. 1 : 21, 45; Acts 3 : 22). Matthew adds that it was when they heard this voice they were seized with fear, from which they were recovered only by Jesus’ kindly touch and reassuring words (17 : 6f.). **Suddenly looking round about**: Doubtless, the luminous glory, be-

9. And as they were coming down from the mountain, he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, save when the Son of man should
 10. have risen again from the dead. And they kept the saying, questioning among themselves what the rising

fore which Matthew says they fell on their faces (17 : 6), had dazzled as well as dazed them. When, at the Master's words, they arose and looked about them, they found themselves alone with him. It is easy to see why this experience on the Mount made upon the disciples a lasting impression (cf. not only 2 Pet. 1 : 17f., but also Jn. 1 : 14). It more than confirmed their recent acceptance of their Master's spiritual Messiahship as over against the Nationalism of the Rulers, and strangely illumined the words with which the Master had approved Peter's confession, when he told him it was a revelation to him from God himself; while at the same time it attached a solemn certainty to the distressing announcement the Master himself had made of his suffering, rejection and death which made it difficult for them again to gainsay it, whether they understood its reason and significance or not. (For the psychology of the Transfiguration see Ch. XVIII of Garvie's *Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus*.)

9, 10. **Coming down**—the next morning, as Luke's record would imply (9 : 37). **Tell no man**: This charge to silence, like the previous one regarding his Messiahship, was simply because those who had not reached their spiritual conception of his Messiahship would not only fail to understand what they had seen, but would be sure to misconstrue it in the interests of their political hopes. **When the Son of Man had risen again from the dead**, all danger of precipitating the crisis of his mission would be past, and this experience they had had would then be confirmatory of their message to the world of his Divine Messiahship. Luke does not record this command, though he implies it in his statement of 9 : 36. **They kept the saying** (lit. *laid hold of, seized, held fast*)—as something they could not let go. **Questioning . . . what the rising . . . from the dead should mean**: Though the Master, just a few days before, had announced his Resurrection as well as his Passion, the former element had been so overshadowed by the latter that it had made little or no impression upon them (cf. 8 : 31-33). If they had thought of it at all, it was probably only as an event which was to occur in connection with the general Resurrection at the last day—this great consummation coming to pass perhaps a little sooner because of the Passion. Now, however, the Master's announcement is confined to his Resurrection, and it takes hold of all their thinking as something which is to occur apart

11. again from the dead should mean. And they asked him, saying, ¹ *How is it* that the scribes say that
12. Elijah must first come? And he said unto them, Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things: and how is it written of the Son of man, that he should suffer

¹ *The scribes say.*

from the general Resurrection definitely and distinctly, in their own lifetime and that probably before long, and they were utterly confused as to what it could mean.

11-13. But behind this confusion lay another and more fundamental perplexity. In their experience on the Mount they had been conscious of the presence of Elijah. Now the **Scribes** taught—and the Scripture itself supported their teaching (cf. Mal. 4 : 5f.)—**that Elijah must first come**, to prepare the people for the ushering in of the Messianic era. They had witnessed, indeed, the presence of Elijah, but not in any activity among the people to prepare them for the Messiah, on the contrary, secluded from the people, for the purpose only of converse with the Messiah himself. If, as the Master had impressed upon them, his own work was almost finished, how was the preparation for it, taught by the Scribes and foretold by Scripture, to be understood? It was a perfectly natural perplexity, but one which would not have been present in their minds had they appreciated the service rendered to the Master by him who had been their master before they had transferred their discipleship to Jesus. So Jesus shows them that the function assigned by Scripture and the Scribes to Elijah had been already performed by the Baptist, only that their expectation as to what would result from this preparation by Elijah had left out of account the spiritual character of the Baptist's ministry and the necessary hostility to it on the part of those who had no spiritual receptivity to its message. **Elijah indeed cometh first and restoreth all things**—the Scriptures and the Scribes are right—only (as Matthew, who is primary here, adds, 17 : 12) the religious leaders—as well as the disciples themselves—did not recognize him, because they failed to understand that his restoring ministry must be a spiritual one and therefore must bring him necessarily to suffering and death. Consequently, if they, as well as the Scribes, had not understood what Scripture required of the Messianic forerunner, in the way of suffering and rejection, how were they to explain what is **written of the Son of Man that he should suffer many things and be set at nought?** As a matter of fact, **Elijah is come** and the religious leaders have **done unto him** what their hostility to his spiritual ministry impelled them to do—as the ministry of Elijah himself made

13. many things and be set at nought? But I say unto you, that Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him whatsoever they would, even as it is written of him.

14. And when they came to the disciples, they saw a great multitude about them, and scribes questioning

15. with them. And straightway all the multitude, when they saw him, were greatly amazed, and running

16. to him saluted him. And he asked them, What ques-

plain might be expected of his antitype (cf. 1 Kings 19 : 2, 10). Matthew (who is again primary here) adds that the disciples thereupon "understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist" (17 : 13). This makes clear that the reason why they had not understood his former reference to the Baptist as Elijah (cf. Matt. 11 : 14) was because they had not yet reached the spiritual conception of the Master's ministry, much less that of the Baptist, since they had not then come—as they were only now with difficulty beginning to come—to the realizing sense of how a spiritual ministry must, in view of the political materialism to which Judaism was committed, necessarily bring upon itself hostility and rejection and death.

(3) *The Healing of the Epileptic Boy, 9 : 14-29*

14. **A great multitude:** The disciples' confession had been made on the way towards the suburbs of Cæsarea Philippi. The week which had followed that event Jesus probably spent in these villages, being less in retirement from the people, now that the main result of his instruction of the disciples was secured. In such a case, it would not be long before a following would gather around him and cases of sickness be pressed upon him for healing (cf. 7 : 24f.), and in his absence, upon his disciples (cf. 6 : 12f.). On this particular occasion, the crowd had been augmented because of the discussion which was going on; for the **Scribes** were **questioning** (lit. *disputing*) with the disciples, doubtless as to the cause of their inability to heal the case which had been brought to them (see ver. 18).

15. **Amazed**—startled, and at the same time relieved (cf. 16 : 5). It was not the shock of awe, as though his person still bore the glory of the Transfiguration, for they ran to him and **saluted** him, as was their habit with the Rabbis. It was rather the surprise of his unexpected and yet most opportune appearance.

16-18. **He asked them**—the people who had run to meet him,

17. tion ye with them? And one of the multitude answered him, Teacher, I brought unto thee my son, who
 18. hath a dumb spirit; and wheresoever it taketh him, it dasheth him down: and he foameth, and grindeth his teeth, and pineth away: and I spake to thy disciples that they should cast it out; and they were not able.
 19. And he answereth them and saith, O faithless generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I

for the only impression he got as he approached the place was of a dispute between the people generally and the disciples. **A dumb spirit**—designated by Jesus in his exorcising command “dumb and deaf spirit” (ver. 25). In view of the fact that epilepsy—as Matthew distinctively names the disease (17 : 15)—is mostly attended by complete unconsciousness, the impression on the bystanders of dumbness and deafness might be complete. The cry referred to in Lk. 9 : 39 usually precedes the attack. **Dasheth him down** (lit. *rendeth him*): The reference is to the initial convulsions with which the patient is seized and thrown to the ground. **Grindeth** (lit. *squeaketh*) **the teeth**. **Pineth away** (lit. *withereth up*): This may indicate either the general wasting effect of the disease upon the system, or the distinctive stiffening and convulsive setting of the limbs during the first stage of the attack, or the stupor which follows the final stage and which may be long continued (cf. ver. 26).

19. **Answereth them**: Jesus' reply is addressed not merely to the father, but to the general company, including most specifically the disciples. They were all characterized as belonging to the **generation** with whose unbelieving presence he was constantly oppressed—the Scribes, because of their hostile attitude toward the disciples, in view of their failure, the father, because of the hopelessness into which he had fallen through the disciples' failure, and the disciples themselves, because of the failure they had made. When we remember that they had more than once received authority to cast out demons (cf. 3 : 15; 6 : 7, 13), and that they had not only been spiritually instructed during the recent period of retirement, but in virtue of this instruction had come to definite spiritual convictions regarding himself and his ministry, we can understand the Master's disappointment at their failure to realize that spirituality of ministry which before long would be a necessity to them, if his work was to be carried on. It was similar to his disappointment at their inability to understand his warning against the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod (8 : 17, 21)—only deepened by his experience on the Mount,

20. bear with you? bring him unto me. And they brought him unto him: and when he saw him, straightway the spirit tare him grievously; and he fell on the
 21. ground, and wallowed foaming. And he asked his father, How long time is it since this hath come unto
 22. him? And he said, From a child. And oft-times it hath cast him both into the fire and into the waters,

which had made him feel all the more intensely the dependence of his work on the spirituality of vision and service with which his disciples should be possessed. **How long shall I be with you . . . bear with you?** All their experience of his Ministry—personal and instructional—appeared to have been in vain. How long would he have to be with them and bear with them in order spiritually to empower them for the work they eventually would have to face? Their faithlessness was, consequently, not the lack of some specific faith which they should have exercised in order to secure specific power for this particular malady, but that general lack of conscious fellowship with him, as one spiritually able himself to cast out demons and, therefore, spiritually able through this fellowship to give them power to cast them out. Of this fellowship they had been conscious on their last heralding tour (cf. 6 : 13); but they had lost it during his short absence from them on the Mount. Evidently it was not to become an abiding element in their lives until Pentecost (cf. Acts 2 : 43).

20. **Tore him grievously** (lit. *completely convulsed him*) . . . **fell to the ground**—a separate statement of the two symptoms of the first stage of the attack, which are combined in the preceding phrase “dasheth him down” (ver. 18). **Wallowed** (lit. *rolled around*)—the muscular spasms of the second stage, which throw the whole body into violent agitation.

21-24. **How long time . . . come unto him?** Jesus’ desire was to arouse in the father’s soul a faith that would measure up to the conditions with which he was confronted in the case. The father’s reply that the boy had been afflicted **from a child**, and that, through the disease, he had often tried to destroy himself, showed that the case was one of long standing as well as of desperate character, and that his failure to obtain relief for it through ordinary exorcism and from the disciples had brought him to a state of almost hopelessness as to any cure at all. **If thou canst!**—a throwing back upon the father of his own expression in such a form as to emphasize the element of doubt which lay in it. **All things are possible . . . be-**

- to destroy him: but if thou canst do anything, have
 23. compassion on us, and help us. And Jesus said unto
 him, If thou canst! All things are possible to him that
 24. believeth. Straightway the father of the child cried
 out, and said,¹ I believe; help thou mine unbelief.
 25. And when Jesus saw that a multitude came running
 together, he rebuked the unclean spirit, saying unto
 him, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I command thee,
 26. come out of him, and enter no more into him. And
 having cried out, and ² torn him much, he came out:
 and *the boy* became as one dead; insomuch that the
 27. more part said, He is dead. But Jesus took him by
 28. the hand, and raised him up; and he arose. And
 when he was come into the house, his disciples asked
 him privately, ³ *How is it* that we could not cast it out?
 29. And he said unto them, This kind can come out by
 nothing, save by prayer.⁴

¹ Many MSS. add *with tears*.³ *We could not cast it out.*² *convulsed* cf. 1:26.⁴ Many MSS. add *and fasting*.

lieveth: The possibility of the cure depended only upon the reality of the father's faith (see Hogg, *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*, p. 169f.). **I believe; help thou my unbelief:** The father is willing to believe as far as he can, but wishes his poor faith to be responded to by Jesus, in spite of the imperfection which still resides in it.

25-27. **Having cried out:** Doubtless, a fresh attack, though less acute and followed by the stupor which always ends the series of seizures. From this stupor Jesus aroused him and from that hour the boy was cured (cf. Matt. 17:18).

28, 29. **How is it that we could not cast it out?** That the disciples did not understand the reason for their failure shows how slow of mind they were, as well as how lacking in spiritual fellowship with their Master. **This kind**—not this case by itself, but all cases of demonic possession, as constituting a peculiar class. **By nothing save by prayer:** After his inclusion of the disciples in the "faithless generation" (ver. 19) and his demand upon the father for faith (ver. 23), it is clear that Jesus does not mean that the disciples lacked an

(B) On the Last Journey to Jerusalem, 9 : 30-10 : 52

30. And they went forth from thence, and passed through Galilee; and he would not that any man
 31. should know it. For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, The Son of man is delivered up into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and when he is
 32. killed, after three days he shall rise again. But they understood not the saying, and were afraid to ask him.

expression of their faith in prayer, but that they lacked the faith which would naturally express itself in prayer (cf. Matt. 17 : 20). And this faith was not mere general belief in religious truth, but a specific sense of dependent fellowship with him, as powerful in himself, and thus the source of power for them over these peculiar maladies of demonic possession. Involving, as they did, the presence of an evil power, they necessitated the presence of a spiritual power in those who would cast them out. While, therefore, faith was necessary for all miracles (cf. 11 : 23) and prayer, as expressing faith, for all bestowal of power (cf. 11 : 24), this kind of malady would not yield unless the evil power within it recognized the presence of a mastering spiritual power in those who would cast it out (cf. Acts 19 : 13-16). Luke makes no mention of the disciples' question, while Matthew enlarges the Master's answer, along the lines of his remarks in connection with the fig tree (21 : 21f.).

(1) Return through Galilee, with a Second Announcement of the Passion, 9 : 30-32

30-32. **Passed through Galilee** (lit. *passed alongside through Galilee*)—evidently off of the beaten tracks. (But see ver. 33f.). The marginal reading in Matt. 17 : 22 would seem to indicate that they broke up into small groups, going different routes, and reassembling afterwards. Most probably, they came along the less frequented roads, avoiding Bethsaida and the crossing of the Lake. **He would not that any man should know it:** The reason for this is given in the following verse. He was still in the process of preparing his disciples for the great crisis soon to come, and he must avoid even the publicity to which they had been subjected in the suburbs of Cæsarea Philippi. Most likely, the disclosure in the case of the epileptic boy of the disciples' lack, not only of spiritual fellowship with him, but of any realizing sense of the need of it, made clear to him the necessity of renewed instruction in the time still left to them

33. And they came to Capernaum: and when he was in the house he asked them, What were ye reasoning on the way? But they held their peace: for they had disputed one with another on the way, who *was*

before they mingled with the travellers along the road to Jerusalem. **Delivered up** (rendered "betrayed," in 3 : 19): This is the new element in the announcement (cf. 8 : 31), and it was this strange and hard to be credited prediction—apparently already in process of accomplishment (note the present tense, "is delivered up")—that they could not understand and about which, naturally, they **were afraid to ask him**, lest it should unfold things more unwelcome and disheartening than anything they had yet heard of this coming catastrophe. Matthew says nothing of their difficulty of understanding what was meant (17 : 23); while Luke speaks of the meaning as having been hidden from them, with the purpose that they should not understand it (9 : 45).

(2) *The Dispute of the Disciples, 9 : 33-50*

33, 34. **Capernaum:** That Jesus with his company should have come into this city, which had been the headquarters of his Galilean work, when his desire was to pass through Galilee without public notice is explained only by the facts given us in the Fourth Gospel—that his former following, centered in this place, had lost all sympathy with his ideas and had practically deserted him (6 : 66). The significance of this alienation Jesus fully understood. He has no hesitancy, therefore, in going again into the city; and it would seem that he made no mistake in so doing, for apparently no attention was given to his presence, beyond an official and probably hostile inquiry made of Peter as to whether his Master was in the habit of paying the half-shekel tax into the Temple treasury (cf. Matt. 17 : 24-27). This was Jesus' last visit to this city. **What were ye reasoning?** It seems strange that in the light of such solemn disclosures as Jesus had been making to the disciples regarding the future before them and his earnest and persistent effort to bring them into a spiritual appreciation of his ministry and their own discipleship, they should have been discussing among themselves who was the greatest—a discussion which must have involved the question as to the honors and preferments which were to come to them in the material Kingdom for which they still looked as the outcome of their Master's mission. They must have had some consciousness of the unfitness of the subject; for when he asked them what it had been, **they held their peace**. Possibly, through some such eschatological statements as are given later in Matt. 19 : 28, and which Jesus may have

35. the ¹greatest. And he sat down, and called the twelve; and he saith unto them, If any man would be first, he shall be last of all, and servant of all.
36. And he took a little child, and set him in the midst of them: and taking him in his arms, he said unto them,
37. Whosoever shall receive one of such little children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.

¹ Grk. *greater*.

made already on more than one occasion, their long held National ideas of the future were nourished and fostered, in spite of the spiritual conditions which the Master's instructions had imposed upon their discipleship. At all events, they preserved this mixture of the material and the spiritual in their ideas during the following journey to Jerusalem (cf. 10 : 35-41), at the Last Supper (Lk. 22 : 24-30; cf. also Jn. 13 : 3-17), and even after the Resurrection (Acts 1 : 6-8).

35-37. **Last of all and servant** (lit. *minister*) **of all**: The Master does not denounce all idea of greatness, but corrects their material conception of it by showing them in what true greatness really consists—in the spirit, not of mere self-depreciation—which is often false pride—but in the spirit of a genuine self-forgetting service to others (cf. 10 : 42-45; Lk. 22 : 24-26). To illustrate this, he takes one of the children of the household and, bringing it out before them all, takes it into his arms (so only Mark)—as though to show them that, Messiah though he was and burdened with the solemn weight of his mission to the world, he had no other thought than through this attention then and there to minister to the happiness of this childish heart. We can easily believe this was his constant custom; he only used it now to point his teaching. **One of such little children**—not necessarily children in years, but children in helplessness and need. Whosoever receives—takes into his care, helps and serves—those who are in need of such ministry, ministers not only unto them, but unto me, and not only unto me, but unto **him that sent me**. This comes from the fact that this ministry is rendered in his **name**, in other words, that it is done, as their miracles of healing were to be done, in the consciousness of a spiritual fellowship with him, whose aim it was in all his mission, not to be ministered unto, but to minister (cf. 10 : 45). Matthew enlarges upon Jesus' reply (18 : 3f.); Luke practically reproduces it as given by Mark (9 : 47f.).

38. John said unto him, Teacher, we saw one casting
 out demons in thy name; and we forbade him, because
 39. he followed not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not:
 for there is no man who shall do a ¹ mighty work in
 40. my name, and be able quickly to speak evil of me.
 41. For he that is not against us is for us. For whosoever

¹ Grk. *power*.

38-40. **John said unto him:** This may have been an interruption of the Master's teaching, which is obviously resumed at ver. 41—suggested to John by Jesus' reference to a ministry in his name (ver. 37); or, on the same suggestion, it may have been inserted here topically by Mark from some other occasion. In the former case, which seems the more probable, it is a reminiscence on John's part of a much earlier experience; since in the present popularly discredited condition of Jesus' work it was not likely that there were persons abroad using his name in exorcisms. **We forbade him:** If spoken at this time, John's idea was that here was a ministry in his name that was not legitimate, because there was no formal connection of it with the work which they themselves were doing. **Do a mighty work . . . and be able quickly** (properly, *rashly, inconsiderately*) to speak evil of me: The work having been accomplished in his name, there must have been enough of fellowship with him in its doing to at least place the worker in sympathy with the work they were carrying on against the powers of evil, whether there was a formal connection with it or not. Matt. 7 : 22f. is in no contradiction of this position of the Master's; since the wonder workers there are not accused of speaking evil against him, only of the lack of that reality of personal relationship to him which their outward respect for him naturally implied. Conversely, the failure of the disciples to cure the epileptic (ver. 28) was due, not to a lack of real personal relationship to him, but to an absence of that spiritual fellowship with him which their relationship normally called for. So the statement of ver. 40 is not contradicted by the seemingly opposite one of Matt. 12 : 30. In the former case, Jesus means that he who works in sympathy with the good he is doing is really working with him, though not outwardly one of his workers; in the latter case, he means that he who is out of sympathy with what he is doing is really working against him, though one of his acknowledged followers. Matthew has not preserved this incident of John's remark.

41, 42. **A cup of water:** The teaching, interrupted at ver. 37, is here resumed, by showing the disciples that even in services rendered

- shall give you a cup of water to drink, because ye are Christ's, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise
 42. lose his reward. And whosoever shall cause one of these little ones that believe ¹ on me to stumble, it were better for him if a great millstone were hanged
 43. about his neck, and he were cast into the sea. And if thy hand cause thee to stumble, cut it off: it is good for thee to enter into life maimed, rather than having thy two hands to go into hell, into the unquench-

¹ Many MSS. omit *on me*.

to them by those outside, it is not the largeness of the ministry that marks it as really great, but the spirit of conscious fellowship with him in which the act is done—a fellowship that is expressed in the motive behind the doing: **Because ye are Christ's** (lit. *in the name that ye are Christ's*). Luke does not resume the teaching at all, and Matthew takes it up again only at the following verse. **One of these little ones that believe on me**: The reference is not to those who are little in years, but in the maturity of their discipleship (see notes on ver. 37). **To stumble**: Naturally, the converse of the preceding is true, only it receives its real significance in the realm of spiritual and not of physical things; since it is only spiritual injury which can really harm. The injury here referred to is the teaching or example which leads to wrong action on the part of those whose immaturity of religious life makes them lacking in discernment of conscience or in strength of character (cf. Rom. 14 : 13-15, 20-23; 1 Cor. 8 : 4, 7, 9-13, and the Master's own action during this stay in Capernaum, Matt. 17 : 27). **A great millstone** (lit. *an ass-millstone*)—the upper millstone of the larger class of mills, which was turned by an ass, instead of by a woman, as in the case of the hand mills (cf. Ex. 11 : 5; Matt. 24 : 41)—a condition of certain and inescapable destruction.

43-48. **Thy hand cause thee to stumble**: The leading astray of oneself, which is inexcusable because based on self-deception, and avoidable because due to the dominating power of the influences and forces of the material living over the spiritual life to which one consciously yields. **Hand . . . foot . . . eye**—used illustratively for the lesser interests of life, which readily should be sacrificed in order to secure the well-being of the higher spiritual living (cf. Matt. 5 : 29f.). **Life**—is thus figurative for that state of final assured fellowship with God, which is termed in ver. 47 "the Kingdom of God." **Hell** (lit. *Gehenna*)—the Valley of Hinnom, which lay

45. able fire.¹ And if thy foot cause thee to stumble, cut it off: it is good for thee to enter into life halt, rather
 47. than having thy two feet to be cast into hell.¹ And if thine eye cause thee to stumble, cast it out: it is good for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into
 48. hell; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not
 49. quenched. For every one shall be salted with fire.²

¹ Verses 44 and 46, which are identical with ver. 48, are omitted by the best MSS.

² Many MSS. add *and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt*, cf. Lev. 2 : 13.

outside of Jerusalem, and was the site of the ancient fire worship begun by Ahaz (2 Chron. 28 : 3). Through the desecration of this worship by Josiah (2 Kings 23 : 10), and because of the denunciation of its revival under Jehoiakim (Ezek. 20 : 30f.; Jer. 7 : 31f.), the place became an object of such abhorrence that it stood in later Jewish thought as the symbol of the place of eternal punishment (*Bk. Enoch* 27 : 1; *IV Esdras* 2 : 29). There seems to be no evidence that it served as a dumping ground for the bodies of dead animals and criminals and the general refuse of the city, where fires were kept burning to prevent infection. (See art. Gehenna, *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. II.) **Worm dieth not . . . fire is not quenched**—a phrase borrowed from Isa. 66 : 24, where it seems to be suggested by the destructive forces of nature (cf. Isa. 5 : 24; 14 : 11), rather than by processes going on under the supposed use of the Valley of Hinnom. (See notes on ver. 43.) The injuries which one does to his own soul are corrupting and destroying beyond any which may be done to it from outside. Verses 44 and 46 contain this same phrase, repeated as a refrain after the exhortations of vs. 44 and 46, and are omitted as not belonging to the original text.

49, 50. **Salted with fire:** The Old Testament sacrifices were salted with salt to symbolize the covenant relations between God and Israel (Lev. 2 : 13). But now the thing which characterized the personal relations between Jesus and his disciples was that they were to be salted with fire, not as a symbol, but as a test, in order to consume the evil in them and to preserve and purify the good. But this result depended on that self-disciplining power within themselves which ruthlessly sacrificed every lesser interest in life for the sake of the higher spiritual good (see notes on 43), and so turned every testing experience into a strengthening of character (cf. Jas. 1 : 2-4). Whether the fire should destroy or preserve depended upon this spiritual "salt" within them that turned its destructive element into

50. Salt is good: but if the salt have lost its saltness, wherewith will ye season it? Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another.

10. And he arose from thence, and cometh into the borders of Judæa and beyond the Jordan: and multitudes come together unto him again; and, as he was wont, he taught them again.

one that purified and enriched. That "salt" was effective, providing it retained its saltness; if that were lost, there was no way by which it could be artificially restored, and these testing experiences of life be saved from their destructive results. The exhortation with which the teaching closes is thus perfectly in keeping with what has preceded: **Have salt in yourselves, and,** as that gracious power of self-discipline would be lost to them if, in the spirit of self-seeking, they disputed among themselves as to who should be greatest (ver. 33), **be at peace one with another.** Matthew continues the instruction at great length (18 : 10-35); Luke seems to refer to it in 14 : 34f. and, as presented by Matthew as well as by Mark, in 17 : 1-4.

(3) *Departure from Galilee and Journeys in Judæa and beyond the Jordan, 10 : 1-12*

10 : 1. **From thence**—Capernaum (cf. 9 : 33). **Cometh into the borders of Judæa and beyond the Jordan**—a general statement covering the interim between the departure from Galilee and the arrival at Jericho (ver. 46), before his entry into Jerusalem (11 : 1). According to Luke, part of the journey was through Samaria (9 : 51-56; 17 : 11); Matthew says he came into the borders of Judæa beyond the Jordan, as though Judæa extended East of that river (19 : 1); John records that he made two visits to Jerusalem—one at the Feast of Tabernacles, in September (7 : 2, 14), and another at the Feast of Dedication in December (10 : 22)—that after this second visit he retired to Bethany beyond the Jordan (10 : 40)—possibly north of Peræa (cf. Guthe, *Bibel-Atlas*, Plate 14), though the site is uncertain—from which place, at the death of Lazarus, he returned to Bethany, on the Mount of Olives (11 : 1-17), afterwards retiring to a city called Ephraim (11 : 54), a few miles Northeast of Jerusalem, and coming finally from there by the way of Jericho to Jerusalem. Evidently, therefore, whatever may have been his route from Galilee southwards, he did not spend all the time between Summer and the following Spring on the journey, but passed not a little of the interval between his first arrival at Jerusalem, in September,

2. And there came unto him Pharisees, and asked him,
Is it lawful for a man to put away *his* wife? trying
3. him. And he answered and said unto them, What
4. did Moses command you? And they said, Moses
suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her
5. away. But Jesus said unto them, For your hardness

and his final entry, in April, in the city itself, and the rest of it both in Judæa and beyond the Jordan. Luke has inserted some ten chapters of incidents and teachings (9 : 51-19 : 28) as occurring during this period. Many of them are not related in sequence (*e.g.* 11 : 14-36). Some of them clearly belong earlier in his ministry (*e.g.* 10 : 25; 11 : 1; 13 : 10; 14 : 1; 17 : 11; 18 : 1). Matthew compresses his record into two chapters (19 : 1-21 : 1). Mark gives him in one (10 : 1-52). **Multitudes come . . . unto him:** It is clear that after he left Galilee, where his following had broken with him (*cf.* Jn. 6 : 66), probably after he had passed beyond Samaria (*cf.* Lk. 9 : 51-56), the multitudes again crowded around him, and he taught them fully and freely (*cf.* Lk. 12 : 1; 14 : 25; 15 : 1). As the crisis of his work was approaching, it was necessary, not only again clearly to place before the people the spiritual character of his ministry, but to reestablish that sifting process among his followers by which those who were receptive to his message should be drawn personally closer to him and those that were not should have a chance to go their chosen way. (See notes on 4 : 1f.) This accounts for the large amount of parabolic teaching during this period (*cf.* Lk. 10 : 25-36; 11 : 5-13; 12 : 16-21, 42-48; 13 : 6-9; 14 : 16-24; 15 : 3-32; 16 : 1-13, 19-31; 18 : 1-14; 19 : 11-27).

(Question of the Pharisees Concerning Divorce, vs. 2-12)

2-9. **Pharisees**—members of the Pharisaic party. **Is it lawful . . . to put away his wife?** This question they put to him, with the purpose of trying him, testing him, on this question debated between the Schools of Hillel and Shammai, as to whether a man could divorce his wife for any cause (*cf.* Matt 19 : 3), or for no cause save that of infidelity. It may be that they already knew of the pronouncement on this question which Matthew reports Jesus as having made in the Sermon on the Mount (5 : 31f.). At all events, it was an opportunity to drag him into the heated argument of the law's interpretation, as it was debated by the Rabbis and their followers. This they had not yet attempted with Jesus. They had criticized him for apparent blasphemy (2 : 7), for open comradeship with the unchurched (2 : 16), for obvious infractions of the ceremonial law (2 : 24; 7 : 1-5). **In**

6. of heart he wrote you this commandment. But from the beginning of the creation, Male and female made
7. he them. For this cause shall a man leave his father
8. and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh: so that they are no more two,
9. but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined to-

desperation at his popularity, they had accused him of being in league with Satan (3 : 22), and after that popularity had gone, they had tried to entrap him into further disfavor with the people (8 : 11). But here is an attempt to entangle him in the fanatical discussions of the Schools, as the Sadducees later in Holy Week tried to involve him in the radical disputes between themselves and the Pharisees (12 : 18-23), beyond which there was but one possibility—to enmesh him in the political passions of the people against Rome (12 : 13f.). **What did Moses command you?** Jesus goes to the root of the matter by asking for the law on which their question ought to be based. That law is given in Deut. 24 : 1, and is correctly stated by the Pharisees in their reply, **Moses suffered** (*allowed, permitted*) **to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away.** Whether his inquisitors were acquainted with his own position, or not, it was one that was opposed to this position of the Law, but only as a fuller expression is opposed to a less mature expression of the same fundamental principle. This principle was the unlawfulness of separation between man and wife without cause. The Law defined the cause in terms which rested the action largely in the good will and pleasure of the man; but Jesus states that it did so because of the **hardness of heart** on the part of those for whom it was enacted, by which he meant, not stubbornness of will, but crudeness of apprehension. In other words, the law was determined by the immaturity of the civilization for which it was made. Legislation ahead of the age was no more possible then than it is to-day; but behind that immature legislation of the Mosaic Law was the primary principle that God had created the human race **male and female**, and that when they were united in marriage, they belonged together beyond separation, except for cause. The development of civilization in Jesus' day made the full expression of this primary principle possible, and this full expression of it Jesus gave when he added, **For this cause**—because of the physical relation between them created by God—**a man shall leave his father and mother** (“and shall cleave to his wife” is adopted from the Old Testament passage, Gen. 2 : 24, and is not part of the original text of the passage. It should, therefore, be omitted); **and the two shall become one flesh**—in a union which is based on this

10. gether, let not man put asunder. And in the house
 11. the disciples asked him again of this matter. And
 he saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his
 wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against
 12. her: and if she herself shall put away her husband, and
 marry another, she committeth adultery.
 13. And they were bringing unto him little children,
 that he should touch them: and the disciples rebuked

primary physical relation and is, therefore, more close and binding than that which exists between child and parent, and consequently cannot be broken by any act, save that which in itself nullifies the physical relationship and dissolves the union. What therefore God hath joined together: By this underlying principle of the physical relation between man and wife, man has no right to put asunder, by any mere enactment of legal divorce, apart from that act of infidelity which sinfully destroys the Divine union itself.

10-12. This position of the Master was apparently so contrary to the statement of the Law involving such a profound interpretation of its spirit, that when they came together in the house, where they were staying, the disciples naturally went back to the discussion. Jesus replies by assuming his fundamental position that the marriage union cannot be dissolved by mere divorce, and drawing the necessary inference that when it is thus dissolved a further marriage by either party is adultery. The possibility of a formal divorcement of the husband by the wife is given only by Mark, and lay outside of Jewish law. As, however, it was recognized by the Greeks and Romans and its practice was familiar to the disciples and before long would have to be faced by them in their ministry (cf. 1 Cor. 7 : 10-16), there is no reason to doubt that the Master advanced beyond the Jewish situation in his personal instruction to them, and made the statement as given in our passage. Matthew omits the disciples' further inquiry and the Master's reply, though he adds to it a further instruction to the disciples on the question of celibacy (19 : 10-12). He inserts, however, in his answer to the Pharisees, as in his statement in the Sermon on the Mount (5 : 32), the distinctive cause on which divorce is permissible (19 : 9) but which, as shown above, is clearly involved in Mark's record.

(4) Jesus' Blessing of Little Children, vs. 13-16

13. These children may have belonged to the household where Jesus and his disciples were staying, so that the incident may have

14. them. But when Jesus saw it, he was moved with indignation, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me; forbid them not: for ¹ to
15. such belongeth the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein.
16. And he took them in his arms, and blessed them, laying his hands upon them.

¹ of such is.

followed the preceding, though it is possible that Mark took it from some other occasion on the journey and inserted it here because of its topical agreement with the question of the sacredness of the marriage relation. Matthew seems to locate it here (19 : 13); Luke has no statement of its time or place (18 : 15). The fact that from this point on the three Evangelists keep together in their records may possibly indicate that the remaining incidents belong to Jesus' return from Ephraim (cf. Jn. 11 : 54) on his final journey to Jerusalem (Swete, *ad loc.*, and on ver. 46). **Touch them**—either by way of imparting some physical blessing upon their young lives, or after the manner of the benedictions commonly obtained by parents for their children from the Rulers of the Synagogues (Buxtorf, *De Synag.*, p. 138). **Disciples rebuked them**—for claiming the Master's attention with what seemed to them a trivial affair.

14-16. **Moved with indignation** (lit. *was pained, grieved*, given only by Mark)—at the disciples' failure to appreciate children, not so much in themselves, as in their relation to him and his kingdom; **for to such** like minded persons as these children, open-hearted and receptive to his teaching, trustfully dependent upon his help, loving and loyal to himself, **belongeth the kingdom of God**—it is theirs to enter and to enjoy the blessings which it provides. Without such receptivity to the kingdom of God, as a truth presented to the soul and a claim imposed upon the life, it is impossible for the kingdom of God as a relationship to God—to his love and to his life—to open itself to anyone. **He took them in his arms and blessed them, laying his hands upon them**: His blessing was spiritual rather than physical, the symbol of its imparting was the laying on of his hands; but the spirit which stood behind and moved through all the action was expressed by the loving embrace in which he enfolded them. Luke makes no mention of this act of the Master's, while Matthew refers only to the imposing of the hands (19 : 15).

17. And as he was going forth ¹ into the way, there ran one to him, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Teacher, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal

¹ on his way.

(5) *The Question of the Rich Young Man, vs. 17-31*

17. This incident may have followed in sequence upon the preceding one, as that may have done upon the one before it. At the same time, there is the possibility that Mark may have placed it here because of the contrast which it exhibited with the childlike spirit that possessed the kingdom of God. Neither Matthew (19 : 16) nor Luke (18 : 18) give any indication of time or place. **One:** Both Mark and Matthew are indefinite in their reference to him, save that Matthew says that he was a young man (19 : 20, 22), and both unite with Luke in stating that he possessed large wealth (Mk. ver. 22; Matt. 19 : 22; Lk. 18 : 23). Luke alone refers to him definitely in calling him a "ruler" (18 : 18), by which is not meant a member of the Sanhedrin, for his youth would be against such a position, but generally, in the Rabbinic usage of the term, a man of ruling position in the community, which would be natural through his wealth (Swete). **Kneeled to him . . . Good Teacher:** It is clear from the incidents on this journey which Mark has given us, that, outside of Galilee, Jesus had lost none of his popularity and fame. The bringing of little children to him for his blessing (ver. 13); the respect and reverence with which this Young Man addressed him; the persistence with which the Blind Man at Jericho called to him (ver. 47f.); even the ambitious request of the two disciples (vs. 35-37) and the cunning questioning of him by the Pharisees (ver. 2) show, as well as the crowding around him of the multitudes (Lk. 12 : 1; 14 : 25; 15 : 1), that people were still under the power of his personal presence. Possibly Jesus' appearance among the pilgrims to the Passover, which was now drawing nigh (see notes on ver. 13), especially after his continued retirement from public view, created the expectancy at which Luke more than once hints (17 : 20; 19 : 11) that Jesus was now about to proclaim himself and the kingdom which he had so widely heralded in Galilee. At all events, as he proceeded on his way, the crowds that followed were apparently under the strain of some awesome apprehension of coming events (cf. ver. 32). **What** (Matthew had "What good thing," 19 : 16) **shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?** The question, unlike that of the lawyer in Lk. 10 : 25, was perfectly sincere. Jesus had proclaimed the near approach of the Messianic kingdom; what must he do to possess its blessing of eternal life? But it failed at a vital point. The blessings

18. life? And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me
 19. good? none is good save one, *even* God. Thou knowest
 the commandments, Do not kill, Do not commit
 adultery, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness,
 20. Do not defraud, Honor thy father and mother. And
 he said unto him, Teacher, all these things have I

offered in the kingdom that Jesus was to establish were to be secured, not by personal conduct in itself, but by personal conduct which was the outcome of a personal relationship to him. If he was to this young man nothing more than a Teacher—even a Good Teacher—the conduct inquired about was not the spiritual product of a personal commitment of the soul to him, but the meritorious product of a self-complacent conduct apart from him. Jesus must make this clear to him. So he asks him what was involved in the term with which he addressed him, **Why callest thou me Good** (Matthew, who is not primary here, renders it "Why askest thou me concerning that which is good," 19 : 17). **None is good save one, even God:** If Jesus was good to him simply as one who could give wise instruction, then the commandments of the Decalogue were before him: if he kept them perfectly, he would be rewarded with eternal life (cf. Lk. 10 : 27f.). If to him, however, Jesus was good in himself—good, as the Supreme Good, as God is good—then it was for him to commit his life to Jesus' personal following. What would he say? And the young ruler replied, **Teacher, all these things have I observed from my youth**—again, the statement of perfect sincerity, and yet the fact that, with all this careful observance of God's commands, he came to this Teacher for further instruction betrays the fact that his heart was conscious that something more was needed. In fact, his coming was a revolt against the teaching of the Scribes that eternal life was to be secured by a punctilious performance, not only of all the written commands of the Law, but of all the unwritten commands of the Rabbis. He came to ask for a simpler rule—one that could be the expression of his real desire for the kingdom of God. For this consciousness of his lack (cf. Matt. 10 : 20) and this search for its supplying **Jesus looking upon him loved him**; for this showed him as faced toward the one thing that would make eternal life a reality of his possession. **Go sell whatsoever thou hast and give to the poor . . . and come, follow me**—not that the selling of his goods in itself was to give him eternal life, but that the parting with them was to be the measure of his willingness to commit his life to a personal following of Jesus as his Master. To him Jesus was good as a Teacher, but not as the Supreme Good in himself—as God is good.

21. observed from my youth. And Jesus looking upon him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven:
22. and come, follow me. But his countenance fell at the saying, and he went away sorrowful: for he was one that had great possessions.
23. And Jesus looked round about, and saith unto his

22. And here was where he failed. He was willing to follow Jesus' instruction as one who could tell him the commands he should keep in order to win eternal life; but he was not willing to follow Jesus' commands as himself the Lord of his living. He had kept the second table of the Decalogue which forbade harm and injustice to one's neighbor. But this was simply negative. The positive side of this expressed by such a mastership over his great possessions by Jesus he was not willing to undertake. And the reason for his unwillingness was the simple fact that while the need of which he was conscious in his own life was real, he had no appreciation of Jesus' power to supply it in himself. Not Jesus himself, but riches were to him still the highest good.

23-27. The incident was too significant for its lesson to be lost, so turning to his disciples the Master said **How hardly** (*lit with what difficulty*) **shall they that have riches enter into the Kingdom of God!** Here was an example of the power wealth has to dim the eyes to what is supremely good in life. **The disciples were amazed**—for the standards to which they were accustomed in Judaism made men of wealth prominent in the Church, and to their Nationalism—with all the spiritual ideas and conceptions which had come to them through their fellowship with the Master—the Church was still the gateway to the coming kingdom (cf. Acts 1:6; 10:28), and that kingdom was promised to be full of prosperity, with the wealth of the Nations flowing into it (cf. Isa. 60:5, 11). **How hard is it** ("for them that trust in riches" is not a part of the original text, and should be omitted) **to enter into the kingdom of God:** Jesus explains his first statement by showing that entrance into the kingdom was difficult in itself. It was not an easy thing for anyone—situated as men were then in Judaism and Heathenism—to enter the kingdom of God. It meant a change of the entire viewpoint of life—a revolution of the whole living (cf. Lk. 13:24). The inference was obvious—that it must be harder to accomplish this entrance if one's viewpoint was already mastered by wealth, and riches had spread within one that

disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches
 24. enter into the kingdom of God! And the disciples were
 amazed at his words. But Jesus answereth again,
 and saith unto them, Children, how hard is it ¹ for
 them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of
 25. God! It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's
 eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of
 26. God. And they were astonished exceedingly, saying
 27. ² unto him, Then who can be saved? Jesus looking
 upon them saith, With men it is impossible, but not
 28. with God: for all things are possible with God. Peter

¹ Some MSS. omit *for them that trust in riches*.

² Many MSS. read *among themselves*.

soporific of ease and self-contentment that dulled the ear to any call of revolution. Neither Matthew or Luke has any record of this astonishment of the disciples or this repetition of the Master's first remark. Camel . . . needle's eye: The phrase is to be taken literally and is an oriental way of illustrating truth through exaggerated similes (cf. Matt. 6 : 23; 23 : 24). It put a rich man's entrance into the kingdom as a practically impossible thing. Astonished exceedingly (lit. *beyond measure startled out of themselves*): The Master's first statement was that it is hard for a rich man to enter the kingdom: the second was that it is impossible. Almost naturally they asked Then who can be saved? For if what a man has of this world's goods increases the inherent hardness and difficulty of getting into the kingdom, and all but the poverty stricken possess something, who is going to be able to enter it? With men it is impossible . . . possible with God: With men alone, subject as they are to human views and influences, to the controlling and compelling forces of the world, it is hopeless; but salvation is a thing, not only which has to do with God, but in which God has to do with men, and the persuasive and ennobling power of his Spirit over the human spirit is limited by nothing save the final decision of man's will.

28-31. We have left all and have followed thee—implying, as Matthew definitely adds, "What then shall we have" (13 : 27). This outbreak of Peter's came almost naturally upon the incident and the Master's following words. Through God's help the disciples, although possessing this world's goods, had been enabled to leave all and follow the Master—was there assurance in this fact that they

- began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all, and have
 29. followed thee. Jesus said, Verily I say unto you,
 There is no man that hath left house, or brethren,
 or sisters, or mother, or father, or children, or lands,
 30. for my sake, and for the gospel's sake, but he shall
 receive a hundredfold now in this time, houses, and
 brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children,
 and lands, with persecutions; and in the ¹ world to
 31. come eternal life. But many *that are* first shall be
 last; and the last first.
 32. And they were on the way, going up to Jerusalem;
 and Jesus was going before them: and they were

¹ age.

would enter into the blessings of the kingdom? **A hundred-fold**—not of the same things, but of those things which would supply their places more abundantly (cf. 3 : 32-35). These were to come to them **now in this time**, in this present age, before the looked-for future Messianic age, but **with persecutions** which, as they saw from his own ministry, were a necessary accompaniment of a spiritual message and mission to the world. When, however, that Messianic age finally came, there was to come to them in addition that **eternal life** which ever since the prophecies of Daniel (12 : 2) had been looked forward to as the consummated blessings of the kingdom of God. **Many that are first shall be last:** This is added as a warning against the spirit of calculation in which these sacrifices may be made. The Master had indicated the only right spirit when he placed as the condition of their reward that they were to be made for his sake—in the spirit of personal devotion to him. All blessings of his spiritual kingdom, both in this life and that to come, depended upon the spiritual relations of their personal lives to him. Mark's addition "and for the Gospel's sake" is likely, as in 8 : 35, to have been taken from the form given the Master's words in the Apostolic preaching, when the proclamation of his teaching tended to exalt the Gospel to a level with himself. Luke fails to add this last phrase, though he has it at the close of an incident earlier in this period of his Jerusalem journeys (13 : 30); while he also, like Mark, transforms the Master's words "for my sake" into the later idea of "for the kingdom of God's sake" (18 : 29).

amazed; and they that followed were afraid. And he took again the twelve, and began to tell them the things that were to happen unto him, *saying*, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and

(6) *Renewed Announcement of the Passion, 10 : 32-34*

32. **They were amazed** (lit. *astonished, startled, unnerved*) . . . **afraid**: As they neared Jerusalem, the consciousness of what the city had in store for him must have brought upon Jesus a fresh sense of the awful solemnity of the situation he was facing, which could not but have shown itself in his demeanor and communicated itself to those who followed in his company. With a sense of what was resting upon him, he places himself in the lead, and the very act, simple in itself, brings dread upon them; for, however poorly they understood what was to happen, they knew enough to understand a crisis of some sort was impending. Behind them came the straggling crowd who, understanding less, were seized with real fear of approaching danger. Only Mark has this graphic description of this last stage of their journey. It clearly comes from Peter's memory and gives the reason for this renewed announcement of the Passion, for the Master must once more attempt to make clear to his disciples' slow working minds the events which were so soon to take place.

33-34. This announcement is much more extended than either of the two which preceded it (8 : 31; 9 : 31). It is still the Son of Man who is to suffer, but the stages of the suffering are detailed. There is, as in ch. 9, the betrayal into the hands of the religious rulers; and their rejection of him; but there is added to it the fact that **they shall deliver him unto the Gentiles**, and then is given an almost minute description of what the Romans will do to him—**they shall mock him, and spit upon him, and scourge him**, and then follows the details common to both the preceding announcements, although here assigned to the Civil authorities, they shall **kill him**, and then finally the fact with which both the announcements close, **after three days he shall rise again**. The exact correspondence of this prediction with what actually occurred may have been due, to a certain extent, to a recasting of the Master's words in the light of the events; but we must remember that, on the one hand, the Master could easily have foreseen that the death which was to come would have to be at the hands of the Roman Government, since the Jews no longer had the right to execute the death sentences which they themselves pro-

34. shall deliver him unto the Gentiles: and they shall mock him, and shall spit upon him, and shall scourge him, and shall kill him; and after three days he shall rise again.
35. And there come near unto him ¹ James and John, the sons of Zebedee, saying unto him, Teacher, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we
36. shall ask of thee. And he said unto them, What

¹ *Jacob.*

nounced, that scourging would be an almost certain accompaniment of the execution, and that mocking would be a most probable one, in view of his claim to be the Expected King of the Jews. On the other hand, we must not forget that, in the inability humanly to foresee the decision of the Roman Governor, the statement that Death would issue at all was as clear a prediction as that it would be followed by a resurrection (Gould, *ad. loc.*). Matthew's explicit statement of the form of the death and that the rising would be definitely on the third day (20 : 19) are doubtless read back into the words. Luke closes the prediction with the statement, which seems to be implied by the silence of Matthew and Mark, that the disciples failed to comprehend even this final announcement, as they had the other two (18 : 34).

(7) *The Ambitious Request of James and John, 10 : 35-45*

35-37. **James and John:** Matthew states that it was the Mother of these two disciples who made the request in their behalf (20 : 20). If this incident followed upon the Master's solemn and explicit announcement of the tragic events which were close before them—as there seems to be no reason to doubt it did—it not only confirms Luke's statement (18 : 34) that the prediction failed to penetrate their understanding, but gives us a new idea of the persistent Nationalism of their Messianic expectations, which, in spite of the spiritual conception of their Master's Messiahship to which they had come, could move along with the impression they must have had of at least the foreboding nature of the impending experiences. This Nationalism had doubtless been nourished by the promise the Master had just made of the rewards which were to come to his disciples for the sacrifices they had made for his sake (see notes on vs. 29-31, and note the addition given in Matthew's record, 19 : 28), the spiritual character and conditions of which, however, they had failed to com-

37. would ye that I should do for you? And they said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on *thy* left hand, in thy glory.
38. But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink? or to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?

prehend, and was a new expression of the ambitions which had led them recently, on the way to Capernaum, to dispute among themselves who was the greatest (9 : 34). That this request should come from two of the three disciples who had been drawn into close intimacy with the Master (cf. 5 : 37; 9 : 2) is all the more distressing. **On thy right hand . . . left hand, in thy glory** (Matthew renders it "thy kingdom," 20 : 21)—the places of honor at the side of a king (1 Kings 2 : 19; Ps. 110 : 1; Acts 7 : 55f.). Most probably, his definite promise to the disciples that they should sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel, when Jesus should sit on "the throne of his glory" (Matt. 19 : 28), had stirred in them the wish to have the thrones of honor assigned to them, which, however, would carry with them the seats of honor at the table of his kingdom (Lk. 13 : 29; 22 : 29f.).

38-40. **Are ye able to drink the cup . . . be baptized with the baptism?** He does not denounce their self-seeking petition, but reminds them of the conditions it involves. The rewards which were to come to them for their sacrifices were to bring with them persecutions (ver. 30); the thrones and the banquet seats which were to be theirs at the consummation of his kingdom were to be given them only as they had followed him (Matt. 19 : 28), and that following was to take them with him through all the testing trials that were to come upon him (Lk. 22 : 28-30). The banquet cup that they had in mind (Gen. 40 : 11f.) was to be also a cup of sorrow and suffering (14 : 36); the initiation into his kingdom which they were thinking of was to be a baptism whose shuddering woe would oppress and afflict his soul until it was accomplished (Lk. 12 : 50). Were they equal to all this? Their response, **We are able**, represented their ignorant confidence as to the outcome of the Master's mission which was due to their persistent Nationalism (cf. Lk. 19 : 11; Acts 1 : 6). **The cup . . . ye shall drink:** For James, this was fulfilled in his martyrdom early in the experience of the Jerusalem Church (Acts 12 : 1f.), and, in his brother's case, most probably in his condemnation by the Emperor Domitian to exile in the Isle of Patmos (Rev. 1 : 9. See art. on John the Apostle, *Standard Bible Dictionary*). The Master's words, in view of the general conditions he has in mind

39. And they said unto him, We are able. And Jesus said unto them, The cup that I drink ye shall drink; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall
 40. ye be baptized: but to sit on my right hand or on my left hand is not mine to give; but *it is for them* for
 41. whom it hath been prepared. And when the ten heard it, they began to be moved with indignation

on which their rewards were to be granted (see notes on ver. 38), cannot be pressed to mean that they were to suffer specifically a martyr's death. **Is not mine to give but . . . for whom it hath been prepared** (Matthew, who is not primary here, adds "of my Father," 20 : 23): These preferments do not come by arbitrary assignments, even from himself, but in the way of that which is prepared for those who have fitted themselves to receive it (cf. Matt. 25 : 31-46).

41. **The ten . . . moved with indignation**—not in moral criticism of the action of the two disciples, but in bitter jealousy at the advantage which they had sought to gain over the rest (9 : 34).

42-45. **Them**—the Ten, though the remarks were doubtless addressed to them all. **Accounted to rule** (lit. *reputed to rule, seem to rule*)—not that their rule was not actual, but that it was not ideal. It did not rest upon their inherent ability to rule, to say nothing of their moral qualifications for ruling. **Lord it over them** (lit. *bring under one's dominion, or mastery*, cf. Acts 19 : 16)—as a despotic and tyrannical course of action, this is almost a natural consequence of their lack of the ideal qualities of rule. **Great ones**—a general term, viewed from the point of rank, as the preceding one—"those who are accounted to rule"—was, viewed from the point of function. **Exercise** (lit. *wield*) **authority over them**—with the same lack of moral consideration as was involved in the "lording it over them." **It is not so among you**—not that this was not the spirit of which they partook—for it was: but that it was not the spirit created in their midst, to which as an ideal they were to adhere. On the contrary, they are to understand, as he had already taught them in their dispute about greatness among themselves (9 : 35-37), that true greatness consists in willingness to minister to others' needs and serve the interests of all—to which he adds, as the highest illustration of the principle which could be given, the object which he had set before himself in his own mission—**not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and** (lit. *and so*, as a consequence of that purpose, and as involved in it) **to give his life a ransom for many** (lit. *in place of many*): A

42. concerning ¹ James and John. And Jesus called them to him, and saith unto them; Ye know that they who are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over
43. them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your ² min-
44. ister; and whosoever would be first among you, shall
45. be ³ servant of all. For the Son of man also came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.
46. And they come to Jericho: and as he went out from Jericho, with his disciples and a great multitude, the son of Timæus, Bartimæus, a blind beggar, was sitting
47. by the way side. And when he heard that it was Jesus the Nazarene, he began to cry out, and say,

¹ Jacob.² servant.³ Grk. bondservant, or slave.

ransom was a payment for the release of bondmen (Num. 3 : 49), or of captives (Isa. 45 : 13), or for the recovery of sold land (Lev. 25 : 24), or for the redemption of a life (Ex. 21 : 30). This, with 1 Tim. 2 : 6, is the only use of the word in the New Testament, and means that the Master's life was to be given for the release from the bondage of sin of the lives of many (cf. Rom. 3 : 23f., Gal. 3 : 13; Eph. 1 : 7; Tit. 2 : 14; 1 Pet. 1 : 18; Heb. 9 : 12-14). That this bondage of sin would, in the end, result in a death more significant than that of the body may rightly be inferred from the Master's words in 8 : 35-37; 9 : 43-48; so that the giving of his life for their freedom from sin would be in fact a giving of it to prevent the loss of their higher spiritual lives. (See Hogg, *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*, pp. 183-186.)

(8) *Arrival at Jericho and the Healing of the Blind Beggar, 10 : 46-52*

46, 47. **Jericho** (Possibly, "City of fragrance," or *City of the Moon-God*), in the Old Testament sometimes called "City of palm-trees," Deut. 34 : 3; Jud. 1 : 16; 3 : 13; 2 Chron. 28 : 15—an important city, some 5 miles North of the Dead Sea, about 15 miles Northeast from Jerusalem, and 6 miles West of the Jordan. It lay 820 ft. below

48. Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on me. And many rebuked him, that he should hold his peace: but he cried out the more a great deal, Thou son of
 49. David, have mercy on me. And Jesus stood still, and said, Call ye him. And they call the blind man, saying unto him, Be of good cheer: rise, he calleth
 50. thee. And he, casting away his garment, sprang up,

the sea level and was located in a region of great fertility, but of enervating heat. The Herodian family made much of it in fortifications and buildings, and it was there that Herod the Great died. It never became Hellenized, being saved from this, perhaps, by the new city of Phasaëlis, which Herod built to the North of it and which, doubtless, attracted the newer life to itself. **A great** (lit. *sufficient*, here better rendered *considerable*) **multitude**: This was not necessarily made up wholly of the distinctive following of the Master, but consisted largely of the general crowd of Passover pilgrims, which he would meet at this place and of which his own band of disciples and followers would form a part. **The son of Timæus**, which is Mark's interpretation of the following Aramaic name, **Bar** (*Son of*) **timæus**. Neither Matthew nor Luke, who are not primary here, give any name; while Matthew speaks of there being two persons, instead of one, perhaps having confused this miracle with one which he gives earlier (9 : 27). Luke further records the incident as having occurred as they were drawing near the city (Matt. 20 : 29f.; Lk. 18 : 35). **Sitting by the wayside**—possibly just outside the gate, where he could attract the attention of those who entered and left the city. **When he heard . . . Jesus the Nazarene**: Luke explains how he came by this information, through the tramping past him of the crowd and his inquiry as to what was taking place (18 : 36f.). **Thou son of David**—not necessarily indicating the personal conviction of the beggar, though he doubtless shared in the common belief in Jesus as a wonder worker. More probably, this title was caught up from some of the people in the crowd—followers of the Master, who were still persuaded that he was soon to proclaim himself the Nation's Messiah (cf. Lk. 19 : 11).

48-50. The fact that, when he persisted in his cry, **many rebuked him, that he should hold his peace**, would seem to accord with the popular feeling that, while this was in the nature of a Messianic procession to the Holy City, it must not be interrupted with a public proclamation of the Messiahship before the city was reached. So, on the other hand, would they be in accord with this Messianic spirit

51. and came to Jesus. And Jesus answered him, and said, What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? And the blind man said unto him, Rabboni, that
52. I may receive my sight. And Jesus said unto him, Go thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole. And straightway he received his sight, and followed him in the way.

4. *The Messianic Work in Jerusalem, chs. 11-13*

11. And when they draw nigh unto Jerusalem, unto Bethphage and Bethany, at the mount of Olives, he

when they gave him their encouraging summons, **Be of good cheer, he calleth thee** (given alone by Mark), when Jesus himself stopped and bade them bring him to him.

51, 52. **Garment**—the outer mantle. **What wilt thou?** The persistency of his cry and the eagerness of his coming, guided though it was by those who summoned him (cf. Lk. 18 : 40,) showed, not only his desire for help, but his belief that it could be given. Jesus will bring such faith as he has to definite expression by his question. **Rabboni**—a fuller form of Rabbi, a common address of respect. It was given to Jesus during his ministry by those outside his following (Jn. 3 : 2; 6 : 25), as well as by his disciples (9 : 5; 11 : 21; Matt. 26 : 25, 49; Jn. 1 : 38, 49). John interprets it as meaning "Teacher" (20 : 16). Matthew (20 : 33) and Luke (18 : 41) substitute for it here "Lord." (cf. Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, pp. 324f., 340). **Thy faith hath made thee whole** (lit. *saved thee*.) There is no process of healing here, as in the cases in the Decapolis (7 : 33) and at Bethsaida (8 : 23-25). This is Jewish region, and he is dealing with one whose religious ideas are not clouded by paganism. **Followed him in the way:** His instant cure had doubtless brought him into the Messianic enthusiasm of the multitude, and he follows in the company of Jesus, not merely out of gratitude for what had been done to him, but with a conviction wrought by that cure, that what doubtless was spoken on all sides about his being the coming king was true (cf. Lk. 18 : 43).

(1) *The Public Entry into Jerusalem, 11 : 1-11*

11 : 1-3. **Bethphage** (probably, *House of figs*)—an unidentified village, on the road from Jericho. According to the Talmud, it

2. sendeth two of his disciples, and saith unto them,
Go your way into the village that is over against you:
and straightway as ye enter into it, ye shall find a
colt tied, whereon no man ever yet sat; loose him,
3. and bring him. And if any one say unto you, Why
do ye this? say ye, The Lord hath need of him; and
4. straightway he ¹ will send him ² back hither. And
they went away, and found a colt tied at the door

¹ Grk. *sendeth*.² *again*.

lay just outside the city boundary of Jerusalem (Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 68). **Bethany** (probably, *House of dates*)—a small village on the East slope of the **Mount of Olives**, somewhat farther from Jerusalem (cf. Jn. 11 : 18), on the same road from Jericho as Bethphage. In the statement (which is practically repeated by Matthew 21 : 1 and Luke 19 : 29), the place farthest away (Jerusalem) is given first, as indicating the general terminus, and the two villages (Bethphage and Bethany), as marking the distance which had been reached in its direction. As the latter of these villages was the one to which they had now come, **the village that is over against you** was doubtless Bethphage, being so described, probably, as lying over the other side of the ascent of the Mount. According to John, the giving of this commission occurred on the morrow after their arrival at Bethany (12 : 1, 12). **A colt**—the young of either a horse or an ass. Matthew, who cites later the passage from Zechariah 9 : 9, gives it definitely as the foal of an ass (21 : 2). **No man ever yet sat**: This may have been read back into the Master's instructions from the Apostolic interpretation of the event, based on the tradition regarding the sepulchre as given in Lk. 23 : 53, and on the general Old Testament idea that an unused animal was necessary for sacred purposes (cf. Num. 19 : 2; Deut. 21 : 3). At the same time, the other details of foreknowledge involved in this story do not make this one unnatural or unlikely. (See on other occasions 14 : 13; Matt. 17 : 27; Jn. 1 : 48). **Straightway he will send him back hither**: Mark alone gives this as part of the answer which the disciples are to make in case of protest against the removal of the colt. Matthew refers the immediacy of action to the owners of the animals in letting them be taken (21 : 3). Luke makes no reference to any action.

4-6. The details of the expedition are furnished by Mark alone. Matthew contents himself with saying that the disciples, having found things as the Master had told them they would, carried out his command (21 : 6); Luke compresses his record of what they dis-

5. without in the open street; and they loose him. And certain of them that stood there said unto them, What
6. do ye, loosing the colt? And they said unto them even
7. as Jesus had said: and they let them go. And they bring the colt unto Jesus, and cast on him their gar-
8. ments; and he sat upon him. And many spread their garments upon the way; and others branches, which

covered into the statement that it was as Jesus had described it (19 : 32), and then practically follows Mark in his statement of how they accomplished their commission (19 : 33-35a). **At the door**—of the house, but **without** (*i.e.* outside the courtyard of the house) **in the open street** (lit. *in the roundabout road*)—the narrow alley which, in the closely built villages, was the only way around the house (see art. Street, Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. IV). There the colt had been tied, to have it out of the way of the traffic which passed along the congested street in front of the house. These minute details make probable that Peter was one of the two disciples sent on the errand and is giving here his personal reminiscence (cf. Lk. 22 : 8).

7-10. **Spread their garments** (outer cloaks) **upon the way**: This was an impulsive act of homage (cf. 2 Kings 9 : 13), which was doubtless suggested by the spreading of cloaks upon the colt in place of a saddle-cloth, and led in its turn to the further hurried gathering of **branches** (lit. *layers to be trodden or slept upon*)—leaves, reeds, leafy twigs (Matthew confines them to "branches from the trees," 21 : 8) **from the fields** along the road, to make a pathway for this Messianic Ruler. **They that went before** (so also Matthew, 21 : 9)—probably the multitude referred to in Jn. 12 : 12f. who, hearing of the expected Messianic proclamation, had come out with palm branches to greet the coming King and, meeting the procession which had formed, turned around and led it on its way. **They that followed** would be the multitude that had accompanied Jesus on the road, augmented by the villagers of Bethany and Bethphage. Then, as the procession descended the Western slope of Olivet towards Jerusalem (Lk. 19 : 37), the two crowds united in shouting **Hosanna** (lit. *Save [us]!*); **blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord**. This is taken from an invocation in Ps. 118 (ver. 25f.), one of the group of six Praise Psalms (113-118) which were sung at Passover, Pentecost, Tabernacles, and Dedication. It was of a character to be associated with the people's hope of National restoration, and would easily suggest itself in the circumstances of this triumphal procession.

9. they had cut from the fields. And they that went before, and they that followed, cried, Hosanna; Blessed
10. *is* he that cometh in the name of the Lord: Blessed *is* the kingdom that cometh, *the kingdom* of our father David: Hosanna in the highest.
11. And he entered into Jerusalem, into the temple; and when he had looked round about upon all things, it being now eventide, he went out unto Bethany with the twelve.

Matthew's phrase, "Hosanna to the Son of David," 21 : 9, is probably added from later Jewish-Christian liturgies, Swete, *ad. loc.* Luke's addition, "Peace in heaven and glory in the highest," 19 : 38, may be his paraphrasing of the closing refrain in Matthew and Mark, Plummer, *ad. loc.* **Blessed is the kingdom that cometh . . . of our father David**—given only by Mark—was doubtless added by those in the crowd most confident of Messianic developments; while all united in the outburst which it may have prompted, **Hosanna in the highest**—which has no local reference, but means simply an emphatic Hosanna.

11. Luke adds to the narrative of the entry a protest from the Pharisees (19 : 39f.; cf. Jn. 12 : 19), and the Master's lament over Jerusalem (19 : 41-44; cf. 13 : 34f.), both of them probable incidents in the event. Matthew records how profoundly the city was moved and the reply of the enthusiastic multitudes to the inquiry made on every side as to who this personage was (21 : 10f.)—an ignorance as to his personality quite believable on the part of the pilgrim multitudes gathered from all parts of the Diaspora. Mark contents himself with a simple statement of what Jesus did upon entering the city. **Entered . . . into the Temple.** Matthew makes the cleansing of the Temple to have taken place at this time (21 : 12-17). Mark states more accurately that it being now late in the day (**eventide**), he simply **looked round about upon all things**, which he saw there, and **went out unto Bethany with the twelve**. In view of his visits to the city at the Feasts of Pentecost, Tabernacles and Dedication (Jn. 5 : 1; 7 : 2, 14; 10 : 22f.), this sight could not have given him his first knowledge of the return of the Temple traffic from his casting of it out at his first public Passover (Jn. 2 : 13-16). As a matter of fact, he did not go up to the Temple to inform himself of what was going on within its walls. This he already well knew. It was the procession which, in its enthusiasm, had brought him to its doors, pos-

12. And on the morrow, when they were come out from
13. Bethany, he hungered. And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, he came, if haply he might find anything thereon: and when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves; for it was not the season of figs.
14. And he answered and said unto it, No man eat fruit from thee henceforward for ever. And his disciples heard it.

sibly expecting some Messianic proclamation then and there. But his announcement of his claims was to be full and complete, therefore deliberate and only after the rulers, as well as the people, had become thoroughly conscious of his presence in their midst. We are impressed with the growing deliberateness of his action during this last journey to Jerusalem. The burdening consciousness of the sacrificial consummation of his mission which, as the journey progressed, expressed itself in the strangeness of his personal bearing (10 : 32), as well as in the plainness of his speech (10 : 45), seemed, as he neared the city, to give way to a Messianic unreserve that found its climax in this deliberately undertaken and accomplished public entry. The eternal issues which were now fully and finally before the religious rulers of the Nation could not be presented to them hastily and with the compelling crush of the multitude behind them; for they were not political issues, but spiritual, and were to be settled, not by the impulses of action, but by the deliberate decisions of the will. If the entry was in itself a presentation of his claims, it was almost necessitated by the Messianic enthusiasm of the multitude which had accompanied him up to the city and would go with him through its gates. However much their ideas differed from his, he could not refuse their homage without taking all significance and meaning away from his claims in the eyes of the Rulers before whom ultimately they must come.

(2) *The Barren Fig Tree, 11 : 12-14*

12-14. On the morrow—Monday of Holy Week. **From Bethany:** It is evident from Luke's repeated statements (21 : 37; 22 : 39), confirmed by John (18 : 2), that the Bethany to which Jesus went the evening before (ver. 11) and from which he was now returning included the mountain tract in the neighborhood of the village, to which its name was given (cf. Lk. 24 : 50 with Acts 1 : 12), and that the night's rest was taken in the open air and not as the guest of a

15. And they come to Jerusalem: and he entered into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold and them that bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them

hospitable home. This gave him privacy for meditation and prayer (cf. 14 : 26, 32) and possibly accounts for the fact that as he came into the city in the morning, **he hungered**. Although people of the East do not breakfast until after an hour or so of work, we can understand how the sight of a fig tree in foliage and therefore promising fruit awakened in Jesus the sense of hunger. **If haply** (lit. *therefore*) **he might find anything thereon**: The presence of the leaves gave every reason to expect some of the first crop of small and delicately flavored figs (cf. Song Sol. 2 : 13; Jer. 24 : 2). **For it was not the season of figs**: The leaf buds and the small figs with them appear about the end of March; the larger fruit is not ripe till August; and though the greater portion of the smaller fruit falls to the ground with the spring winds (cf. Rev. 6 : 13), there is always left on normal trees a portion to ripen. But here, apparently, was a tree whose early fruit had entirely disappeared, and whose only possession was foliage, since the season for the later and larger fruit had not yet come. (See art. Fig Tree, Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* [Single Vol. Ed.].) The Master's condemnation of the tree was that it was not normal. Against every reasonable expectation, it had failed to retain even a portion of the fruit it had originally possessed, though outwardly it gave every appearance of doing so. From the parable of the fig tree which Luke records him as having spoken on his recent Jerusalem journeys (13 : 6-9), it is clear that the Master saw in the tree an illustration of the Jewish Nation in its relations to God—as having every outward appearance of possessing real religion, and being wholly without it. In his condemnation of the tree, he voiced his denunciation of the Nation's deceptive religious life.

(3) *The Cleansing of the Temple, 11 : 15-19*

15. **Entered into the temple**—to carry out in action the judgment he must already in himself have passed upon the defiant return of the sacrilegious traffic to the House of God (cf. Jn. 2 : 13-16). **Them that sold . . . bought**: The traffic consisted, not only in the sale and purchase of sacrificial animals (cf. Jn. 2 : 14) and the exchange of foreign money for the sacred half shekel of the Temple, but also, most likely, in the furnishing of all the provisions necessary for the sacrifices and ritual of the Temple (wine, oil, salt, etc.), and of the right kind of money for the purchase of these animals and provisions. It also included the changing of the votive offerings of

16. that sold the doves; and he would not suffer that any
 17. man should carry a vessel through the temple. And he taught, and said unto them, Is it not written, My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations? but ye have made it a den of robbers.
 18. And the chief priests and the scribes heard it, and sought how they might destroy him: for they feared him, for all the multitude was astonished at his teaching.

proselytes and foreign Jews into Temple coin (Edersheim, *Messiah*, Vol. I, p. 368f.). Whether the expulsion of the traffickers was accomplished by the same means as at the first cleansing (Jn. 2 : 15), we are not told, but **the tables of the money changers were overthrown**, as then, and instead of a mere command to those **that sold the doves** to take them away (Jn. 2 : 16), he overthrew their **seats**, or benches, on which they sat in transacting their business.

16, 17. **Carry a vessel through the temple** (given only by Mark): The custom had grown up, in spite of its prohibition by the Jewish authorities, for those who were carrying goods or implements to pass through the Temple area as a short cut between the city and the Mount of Olives (Swete, *ad. loc.*). This irreverence also Jesus stopped, and recalled to the traffickers the Scripture passage (Isa. 56 : 7) where the House upon the Holy Mountain was called "My house of prayer." God's designation of it they had ignored by turning it into a **den of robbers**, an accusation which condemned, not only the fact, but the character of the trade they carried on. Obviously, the spirit of this cleansing differs from that which characterized the cleansing at the first Passover. The earlier act was that of a religious Reformer at the beginning of his work, who has in view Israel itself, at the heart of its religious life (Jn. 2 : 16, 20), and sees the bearing of his act upon his own fate in the event of the rejection of his mission (Jn. 2 : 19). The later act was of a broader nature, having in view Israel's relation to the outside nations (ver. 17). It was the act of a Reformer at the end of his work, expressing his final judgment upon the evil's defiant ignoring of his former condemnation of its existence.

18. This is confirmed by the murderous anger which it aroused in the Rulers, unlike the milder action which issued from the earlier act (Jn. 2 : 18). Doubtless, the later demand upon him by these Rulers (vs. 27-33) was prompted by this deed, but it was a demand for his authority in doing this and all the other things of his ministry,

19. And every evening ¹ he went forth out of the city.
 20. And as they passed by in the morning, they saw the
 21. fig tree withered away from the roots. And Peter
 calling to remembrance saith unto him, Rabbi, behold,
 the fig tree which thou cursedst is withered away.
 22. And Jesus answering saith unto them, Have faith

¹ Some MSS. read *they*.

and not merely for a sign to justify him in this one public act he had performed (Jn. 2 : 18). It was as though they would go to the root of all the contention between themselves and him; while his answer (vs. 30-33) is in judgment upon their past behavior towards the spiritual message God had sent to them in the ministry of his great Forerunner now closed, rather than in challenge upon their future attitude towards the spiritual claims of his own mission. Luke condenses the record of the cleansing itself, but adds to it a statement of Jesus' daily teaching in the Temple, which he seems to make the reason for the determination of the Rulers to kill him (19 : 47f.). Matthew parallels Mark in his narrative of the cleansing, but goes beyond Luke in stating that Jesus carried on a general healing work in the Temple, and that it was because of this and the homage paid him by the children that the Rulers were angered, but only to the extent of a protest against the children's behavior.

19. **Every evening** (lit. *when evening came*) **he went forth out of the city**—to his quiet resting place on the Mount of Olives (Lk. 21 : 37).

(4) *The Withering of the Fig Tree, 11 : 20-25*

20-21. **In the morning**—Tuesday of Holy Week. **Withered away from the roots**—a complete destruction of its life, as following the comprehensive denunciation of its falseness. Matthew represents the withering as having taken place immediately, and the whole transaction as having occurred on Tuesday morning. Luke gives no record at all of the event. **Calling to remembrance**: The disciples do not seem to have expected anything more to result from the Master's denunciation than a continued barrenness of the tree. But as the tree in its deceptive appearance was an illustration of the falseness of Judaism, so must it be in the punishment which its pretensions brought upon it—and the punishment of false living is not the continuance of the falseness of living but the loss of life itself.

22-25. **Have faith in God**: The astonishment shown by the disciples at what had happened to the tree evidently indicated to the

23. in God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou taken up and cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that what he saith cometh to pass; he shall have
24. it. Therefore I say unto you, All things whatsoever ye pray and ask for, believe that ye ¹ receive them,
25. and ye shall have them. And whensoever ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any one; that your Father also who is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses.²

¹ Grk. *receiveth*.

² Many MSS. add verse 26, *But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father who is in heaven forgive your trespasses.*

Master the unlikelihood of their appreciating the lesson it was intended to convey. He contents himself, therefore, with taking up the incident at the point where it had impressed them—the unexpectedness of the results, and impressing upon them that all results depend upon the spiritual relation of the soul with God. If there be a real dependence upon the power of God, that power may be drawn upon to accomplish what seem to be as impossible results, as the taking up of **this mountain** on which they were standing and the casting of it into the sea—the Dead Sea, which lay not far away to the East. (The frequency of this proverbial saying among the Jews is evidence—if any were needed—to show that the words were intended figuratively.) **Believe . . . cometh to pass:** The reality of that dependence consists in its ability so to appropriate the divine power as to lay hold of the results aimed at as already potentially present. Such dependence being the condition of success in all the activities of spiritual life, it is consequently necessary in all the petitions of prayer; for not only is prayer a spiritual activity, but one whose effectiveness is conditioned by that fellowship and communion with God that absorbs one's helplessness into the divine power. **Stand**—the normal attitude in prayer (1 Kings 8 : 22; Neh. 9 : 4; Matt. 6 : 5; Lk. 18 : 11, 13), though, under pressure of great solemnity or emotion, the petitioner kneeled (1 Kings 8 : 54; Ezra 9 : 5; Dan. 6 : 10; Matt. 26 : 39; Acts 20 : 36; 21 : 5). **Forgive . . . your Father may forgive you your trespasses:** Fellowship and communion could not be between the petitioner and God, if it were wilfully hindered between the petitioner and his brother man; so that the forgiving here enjoined is real and not a mere formality. Mark alone gives the application of

27. And they come again to Jerusalem: and as he was walking in the temple, there come to him the chief
 28. priests, and the scribes, and the elders; and they said unto him, By what authority doest thou these things? or who gave thee this authority to do these things?
 29. And Jesus said unto them, I will ask of you one ques-

this principle of the fellowship and communion of faith to our relations to our fellow men. The fact that some of these phrases are recorded as occurring in previous teachings of the Master (cf. Matt. 17 : 20; Lk. 17 : 6) is nothing against their actual usage here. The teaching itself is simply an enlargement of his challenge to the father of the Epileptic Boy (9 : 23), and is itself enlarged upon by Paul (1 Cor. 13 : 2). Verse 26 is not a part of the original text and is to be omitted.

(5) *Jesus' Authority Challenged by the Rulers, 11 : 26-33*

27, 28. **Elders** (Matthew adds "of the people" 21 : 23)—the term for the general Pharisaic element in the Sanhedrin. The specific Pharisaic element was composed of the Scribes; the Sadducean element, of the Priests. This delegation, therefore, represented the Sanhedrin in all its elements (cf. 14 : 43, 53; 15 : 1; Matt. 27 : 41; also art. Council, *Standard Bible Dictionary*). **By what** (lit. *what kind*) **authority . . . these things?** The reference is doubtless primarily to Jesus' casting out of the Temple traders (cf. Jn. 2 : 18); although, when it is remembered that since the Feast of Tabernacles, in the previous autumn, Jesus had been teaching and working in Jerusalem and that his ministry had been increasingly angering to the religious leaders (cf. Jn. 7 : 2, 25, 32, 45; 8 : 48, 59; 10 : 31-33), particularly when it is remembered that they had already demanded of him whether he was the Christ (Jn. 10 : 24), this challenging of his authority is likely to have had behind it not simply the interference with the Temple traffic, but the claims that all these months he had been making by word and deed in their midst—in fact his whole assertive ministry. (See reference by Matthew, 21 : 23, and Luke, 20 : 1, to the delegation finding him engaged in teaching in the Temple.) Officially, the question was justified, since they were the custodians of the Temple; but in reality it was a cover for the dilemma in which they were placed; since they could not contest the act, without courting opposition from the popular enthusiasm for Jesus, as well as criticism from the better conscience of the people against the traffic itself; while, on the other hand, they could not approve the act without condemning their own previous permission of the trade.

29-33. **I will ask you one question:** (lit. *word*): This was not to

tion, and answer me, and I will tell you by what
 30. authority I do these things. The baptism of John,
 31. was it from heaven, or from men? answer me. And
 they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall
 say, From heaven; he will say, Why then did ye not
 32. believe him? ¹ But should we say, From men—they
 feared the people: ² for all verily held John to be a
 33. prophet. And they answered Jesus and say, We
 know not. And Jesus saith unto them, Neither tell
 I you by what authority I do these things.

12. And he began to speak unto them in parables. A
 man planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it,

¹ But shall we say.

² for all held John to be a prophet indeed.

avoid answering their question, but to show them, on their own claimed ground of being the guardians of the people's religion, that they were not competent judges of what constituted religious credentials and, therefore, were not fit to challenge his authority (Menzies, *ad. loc.*). **The baptism of John** (*i.e.* the Baptist's ministry in terms of its characteristic symbolic rite) . . . **from heaven, or from men?** Had they answered as in their irreligious hearts they wanted to answer, they would have shown that their judgment was against John's own claim of a prophetic attestation to his ministry (cf. Jn. 1 : 27; Matt. 11 : 7-14); and this they were afraid to do, for the people approved of **John** as a **prophet** (cf. Matt. 14 : 5; Lk. 7 : 29). On the other hand, they could not answer the question in accordance with John's standing as a prophet, since then they realized Jesus would have asked them **Why then did ye not believe him** (cf. Lk. 7 : 30), and to this they could have given no reply. So they answered **We know not**, and by this reply they confessed that they had wholly failed to decide the question of that great teacher's credentials and were in no way fitted to pass upon those of this Teacher to whom John had borne witness (Jn. 1 : 19-27) and who was, as they well knew, greater than John.

(6) *Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, 12 : 1-12*

12 : 1, 2. **Began to speak unto them** (the delegation from the Sanhedrin, 11 : 27; Luke says "unto the people," 20 : 9) **in parables** (Matthew who had already recorded the Parable of the Two Sons,

- and digged a pit for the winepress, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into another
2. country. And at the season he sent to the husbandmen a ¹ servant, that he might receive from the hus-
 3. bandmen of the fruits of the vineyard. And they

¹ Grk. *bondservant*.

21 : 28-32, introduces this one with "Hear another parable"): The Master's purpose in this resumption of parabolic teaching is essentially different from that which he had when he first employed it in his Galilean ministry. Then, it was to further the sifting process which had begun among his followers—primarily, to offer to those who were receptive to his message truths which would draw them to him for further instruction. (See notes on 4 : 2, 10.) Now, it was to accentuate the consequences of that process, which had practically come to its end—primarily, to make clear to those who were hostile to his message the situation into which they had brought themselves. (See notes on ver. 12.) In both cases, the parables were used to disclose truth. In the former, the truth invited inquiry for its further unfolding; in the latter it made inquiry unnecessary by its full unfolding of itself. The former were in their main purpose educative; the latter, in their main purpose judicial. **Vineyard:** The description of what was done to the property is taken so definitely from the judgment passage of Isa. 5 : 1f. as to make obvious from the start the character of the parable and those against whom it was directed (cf. ver. 12). **Hedge** (lit. *a dividing fence*, not necessarily of thorns alone, cf. Isa. 17 : 11, but of loose stones, cf. Ps. 80 : 12; and sometimes of both, cf. Isa. 5 : 5) **about it**—to protect it from the depredations of men and animals (cf. Ps. 80 : 12f.). **Pit for the winepress** (lit. *an under-vat*)—the receptacle for the juice usually excavated in the rock (cf. Isa. 5 : 2) under the tub or vat where the grapes are trodden (cf. Joel 3 : 13; Hag. 2 : 16). **Tower**—to enable the watchmen to overlook the vineyard (cf. 2 Chron. 26 : 10), possibly also as a lodging place for the vine-dressers and for the owner of the vineyard at the vintage time (see art. *Vine, Vineyard*, Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, Single Vol. Ed.); in Isa. 5 : 2 spoken of as built "in the midst" of the garden; usually on the walls themselves (Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 421). **Let it out to husbandmen**—farmed it out to those who would cultivate it on shares. **Season**—the time of the vintage (Matthew says, "when the season of the fruits drew near"). **Of the fruits**—i.e. the share of the vintage due him.

3-11. **Servant:** Mark presents most fully the owner's patient endeavor to secure his fruits. He sends three individual servants and

- took him, and beat him, and sent him away empty.
4. And again he sent unto them another ¹ servant; and him they wounded in the head, and handled shame-
 5. fully. And he sent another; and him they killed: and
 6. many others; beating some, and killing some. He had yet one, a beloved son: he sent him last unto them,
 7. saying, They will reverence my son. But those husbandmen said among themselves, This is the heir;
 8. come, let us kill him, and the inheritance shall be ours. And they took him, and killed him, and cast him forth
 9. out of the vineyard. What therefore will the lord of the vineyard do? he will come and destroy the husband-
 10. men, and will give the vineyard unto others. Have ye not read even this scripture:

The stone which the builders rejected,

The same was made the head of the corner;

¹ Grk. *bondservant*.

these he follows by **many others**, and these by the sending of his **beloved son**. Matthew speaks only of two groups of servants, the second indeed larger than the first, and finally of his son (21:34, 36f.); Luke, merely of three individual servants and of at last his beloved son (20:10-13). **Handled shamefully** (lit. *insulted*): The insult did not consist in mere words, but in the treatment to which they were subjected (cf. Acts 5:41), particularly in the attack upon the head (cf. Matt. 27:29f.). **They will reverence my son**: The expectation on the owner's part was as reasonable, as the conclusion drawn by the husbandmen that by killing the **heir** they would come into possession of the **inheritance** was irrational. **Out of the vineyard**: An indignity added to the murder. **Destroy the husbandmen . . . give the vineyard unto others**: Matthew, who at this point seems to be primary, represents the statement as drawn from the auditors themselves (21:41; see Jesus' custom in other parables, Lk. 7:40-43; 10:36). It came, however, more likely from the people (Lk. 20:9; cf. also ver. 12, below), who were gathered round him as he taught in the Temple (Lk. 20:1), than from the delegation of Sanhedrists. According to Luke, the answer seems to have been

11. This was from the Lord,
And it is marvellous in our eyes?
12. And they sought to lay hold on him; and they feared the multitude; for they perceived that he spake the parable against them: and they left him, and went away.

followed by an instinctive "God forbid" from those who would ward off the realization of the only too evident application of the Parable's lesson (20 : 16). In this case, Jesus' citation of Scripture from one of the commonly accepted Messianic Psalms would be to confirm the certainty of the realization, the significance being all the greater from the fact that it came from the Praise Psalm whose "Hosannas" the multitude had shouted as Jesus entered the city, two days before (11 : 9f.). Matthew adds to this citation a further statement of Jesus in application of the Scripture to the punishment to come upon Judaism (21 : 43f.).

12. **Sought to lay hold on him** (Luke adds "in that very hour," 20 : 19) **for they perceived**, as everyone did, **that he spake the parable against them**: The Master's teaching in the Parable was perfectly clear. Israel was God's vineyard (Ps. 80 : 8f., 14f.; Isa. 5 : 2; Jer. 2 : 21). To secure the fruits of her religious instruction and education, God had sent to her prophets—many of them, at oft repeated times throughout her history (Jer. 7 : 25; 25 : 4)—but she had rejected their messages and persecuted them, often to the death (Matt. 23 : 29-31; Acts 7 : 52; cf. 1 Kings 18 : 13; 19 : 2; 22 : 24-27; 2 Kings 6 : 31; 2 Chron. 24 : 21). And now, after a long time of silence, God had sent unto them his only,—his beloved son—his heir, who, through the intimacy of his relationship to him, came to them with an authority surpassing that of all the prophets or of any angelic messenger he could have sent (cf. Heb. 1 : 1-4). But with this his divinely commissioned Son they were purposing to do as they had done with the prophets (8 : 31; 10 : 33f.; ver. 12), with the reckless idea that somehow, by ridding themselves of him, they would perpetuate forever their religious hold upon the People of God (Jn. 11 : 47f.). For such senseless rebellion against God there could be but one punishment—the destruction of the Rulers, as religious keepers of God's people, and the giving of its care to those whom God would raise up in their place (cf. Jn. 2 : 19; cf. also Lk. 13 : 34f.; 19 : 41-44; Matt. 19 : 27f.). They would then see the ancient prophecy of the Messiah fulfilled in the exalting to glorious power in the kingdom of God of him whom they had rejected (Acts 5 : 30-32), and would be conscious that this enthroning of God's Son was the act of God himself. This effort to

13. And they send unto him certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians, that they might catch him in
14. talk. And when they were come, they say unto him,

lay hold of Jesus was the second arousalment of the Rulers against Jesus during Holy Week. The former, after his Cleansing of the Temple, was, however, rather of a consultation among themselves as to how they might put him out of the way (cf. 11 : 18). This was in the direction of an attempt to get him in their power. But, apparently, they did not actually make the attempt, **for they feared the multitude** (Matthew adds "because they took him for a prophet," 21 : 46). So **they left him, and went away** to further plot against him, while the Master continued his parable teaching—still distinctive in its element of warning, though rather directed to the people than to the Rulers as such (Matt. 22 : 1-14—The Parable of the Wedding Feast).

(7) *The Question of the Pharisees and the Herodians, 12 : 13-17*

13. **They send unto him certain of the Pharisees and . . . Herodians:** Mark is not clear as to the source from which this deputation came. It might be inferred from the close following of this passage upon the preceding one, that it was the general delegation of Sanhedrists who had challenged his authority and had just retired discomfited by his Parable of the Husbandmen. Matthew, however, states definitely that it came from the Pharisees themselves—evidently the Pharisaic party in the Sanhedrin, not necessarily from the body itself—and that the Pharisees who were sent were "their disciples," rather than the masters themselves (22 : 15f.). If so, the matter was shrewdly arranged. The presence of disciples would give an appearance of sincerity in the inquiry, while the combination of Pharisees and Herodians would add to this appearance by presenting as the inquirers those who held opposite sides on the question placed before the Master. Both Pharisees and Herodians paid tribute to the Roman Government as an unavoidable necessity. But the Pharisees resented the necessity as an insult to their claim of Jewish National independence; while the Herodians were favorable to it as maintaining the Herodian dynasty, of which they were the adherents (see notes on 3 : 6). The Master, they hoped, would thus be deceived by the seeming ingenuousness of the inquiry and, at the same time, be entrapped into an answer which must give offence to the followers of the one side or the other. **Catch him** (lit. *as a wild animal in the hunt*). Matthew has "ensnare him," 22 : 15.

14-17. **True**—i.e. sincere, truth loving (cf. Jn. 7 : 18). **Carest not for anyone:** This defined the way in which they considered him true—

Teacher, we know that thou art true, and carest not for any one; for thou regardest not the person of men, but of a truth teachest the way of God: Is it lawful
 15. to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not? Shall we give, or shall we not give? But he, knowing their hypocrisy, said unto them, Why make ye trial of me? bring me a
 16. denarius, that I may see it. And they brought it. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? And they said unto him, Cæsar's.

not intellectually, but courageously loyal to the truth, without fear of men. **Regardest** (Lk., "acceptest," 20 : 21) **not the person of men** (lit. *dost not look at the face of men*): An expression used with a variety of verbs. Frequent in the Old Testament (Septuagint), primarily in the good sense of a king's admitting one into his presence, accepting one, showing one favor (Gen. 19 : 21; 1 Sam. 16 : 7; 42 : 8), secondarily, in the bad sense of looking upon the face rather than upon the heart, considering only the outward appearance and condition (Lev. 19 : 15; Deut. 10 : 17; Ps. 82 : 2; Prov. 18 : 5). Here only in the Gospels. Elsewhere only 2 Cor. 5 : 12; Gal. 2 : 6; Jude ver. 16; all in the bad sense. From it are derived the really compound words, "respect-of-persons" (Rom. 2 : 11; Eph. 6 : 9; Col. 3 : 25; Jas. 2 : 1), "respector-of-persons" (Acts 10 : 34), "to have-respect-of-persons" (Jas. 2 : 9). With these questioners it described the spirit of impartiality which they considered as behind his courageous truthfulness—a truthfulness which showed itself in his teaching, as well as in his life. **The way of God**—prescribed for men by God (cf. Acts 18 : 25f.; also the shortened term for the way of faith which the Christians followed out, Acts 9 : 2; 19 : 9, 23; 24 : 14, 22). However much this introduction to their question may have represented their knowledge of and convictions about Jesus, its purpose was through its flattery to put him off his guard and thus draw from him an incautious reply to their significant questions. **Is it lawful**—in the sense of being permitted by the Law (cf. 2 : 24, 26; 6 : 18; 10 : 2). **Tribute** (lit. *census*) **to Cæsar**—the poll tax paid by the Jews directly into the treasury of the Emperor. **Shall we give . . . not give?** (only by Mark): In all likelihood, the presentation of the question was closed with this categorical inquiry in order to ward off discussion by Jesus and draw from him an answer in which he would commit himself without qualification. **Hypocrisy** (Matthew, "wickedness," 22 : 18; Luke, "craftiness," 20 : 23): They pretended to ask for

17. And Jesus said unto them, Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's. And they marvelled greatly at him.

18. And there come unto him Sadducees, who say that there is no resurrection; and they asked him, saying,

enlightenment and instruction; in reality, they wished to compromise him with the Government or the people. The falsification of his answer which they made to Pilate shows what they would have made out of it had it been against tribute giving (Lk. 23 : 2). **Trial of me**—in the sense of a malicious testing of him. **Denarius**—the Roman silver coin, about 20 cents in value, in which the tribute had to be paid. Matthew speaks of it as "the tribute money," 22 : 19. **Image and superscription**—the effigy of the Emperor surrounded by the inscription containing his name and titles. **Render** (lit. *pay back*) **unto Cæsar . . . God's**: Jesus not only answers their direct question regarding tribute to the Roman Government, but also their implied question regarding loyalty to the kingdom of God. Their fundamental mistake was in making these two things mutually exclusive. Jesus shows them that they have their distinct and independent spheres and that loyalty to God's kingdom does not necessarily involve political rebellion, any more than loyalty to Cæsar's kingdom carried with it necessarily religious alienation and revolt. The present situation was one of subjection to the Roman power. Pay the tax, therefore, which represents the rights of the Roman control, and at the same time render the service which represents the rights of the Divine claims (cf. Rom. 13 : 1-7; 1 Cor. 7 : 21-24; Eph. 6 : 5-8; Col. 3 : 22-25; 1 Pet. 2 : 13-17). The question of refusing obedience to civil authorities when their requirements were in conflict with the supreme duty of the soul to God (cf. Dan. 3 : 18; 6 : 10; Acts 4 : 19; 5 : 29) was another matter not involved in the question they had put before him. (See, however, Hogg, *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*, pp. 97-99.) They (the questioners) **marvelled greatly**—at the way in which he had escaped the trap they had set for him.

(8) *The Question of the Sadducees, 12 : 18-27*

18. **Then come . . . Sadducees**—doubtless delegated, as the Pharisees and Herodians had been, by the Sadducean party in the Sanhedrin (see notes on ver. 13), and not long after the return of the former delegation (Mt. says, "On that day," 22 : 23). The discomfort of the Pharisees allured them to test Jesus on the great question which was in dispute between them and their rivals as to whether there was such a thing as a resurrection of the dead. The

-
19. Teacher, Moses wrote unto us, If a man's brother die, and leave a wife behind him, and leave no child, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up
 20. seed unto his brother. There were seven brethren:
 21. and the first took a wife, and dying left no seed; and the second took her, and died, leaving no seed behind
 22. him; and the third likewise: and the seven left no
 23. seed. Last of all the woman also died. In the resurrection whose wife shall she be of them? for the seven
 24. had her to wife. Jesus said unto them, Is it not for this cause that ye err, that ye know not the scriptures,
-

Sadducees represented the old aristocracy and were consequently conservative in their theology, as well as in their politics, while their general spirit was one of thorough worldliness. Naturally, therefore, they maintained the view that there was no resurrection, not simply because it was the earlier view, but because the denial of a future life accorded with their worldly-mindedness (cf. Acts 23 : 8; Schürer, II, 2, pp. 29-43).

19-23. The purpose in their question, therefore, was not to involve Jesus in political difficulties, but in partisan debate. The question itself was based upon the teaching of the Law in Deut. 25 : 5-10, regarding levirate marriage; though the later legislation of the Priestly Code forbade it (cf. Lev. 18 : 16; 20 : 21), and it is hardly supposable that it was in practice in Jesus' day (Menzies, *ad. loc.*). Consequently, the case cited was not an actual occurrence, though Matthew represents them as presenting it as such (22 : 25). The whole question was rather purely academic, as to whether the provision of the Law could be adjusted to a belief in the resurrection on Moses' part.

24-27. **Is it not for this cause** (*i.e.* the cause which follows, viz. their ignorance of the **Scriptures** and the **power of God**) **that ye err?** Their mistake in attributing an inconsistency between the teaching of the Law and the idea of the resurrection was due to their failure to understand the Scriptures, whose teachings, after all, involved the fact of a future life and the power of God to adjust the resurrected body to the conditions of that life. **Neither marry nor are given in marriage:** The future life is not one of material conditions, as the Pharisees held it to be (see Paul's spiritual advance upon his older materialistic ideas, 1 Cor. 15 : 35-53). **As the angels in heaven—** in whose existence also the Pharisees believed and from whose spirit

25. nor the power of God? For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in
 26. marriage; but are as angels in heaven. But as touching the dead, that they are raised; have ye not read in the book of Moses, in *the place concerning* the Bush, how God spake unto him, saying, I *am* the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of
 27. Jacob? He is not the God of the dead, but of the living: ye do greatly err.

life they might have inferred a more spiritualized existence for those mortals who attain to the life of that heavenly place. While Jesus thus sides with the Pharisees as to the question in dispute, he shows that they, as well as the Sadducees, are mistaken in their views. **As touching the dead, that they are raised:** Jesus had shown them first their ignorance of God's power over the conditions and adjustments of the future life; he will now show them how ignorant they were of the position of Scripture regarding the fact of such a life. **The book of Moses**—the Pentateuch, elsewhere called the "Law of Moses" (Lk. 24 : 44; Jn. 1 : 45; Acts 28 : 23), or simply "Moses" (Lk. 16 : 29). The Prophets are similarly termed the "Book of the Prophets" (Acts 7 : 42). **In the place concerning the Bush** (lit. *at the Bush*, omitted by Matthew, 22 : 31)—at that section of the Law which relates the incident of the Burning Bush (Ex., ch. 3), indicating apparently some pre-Talmudic division of these Books (cf. Rom. 11 : 2 mg.). **He is not the God of the dead but of the living:** The eternally living God could not speak of himself as in such intimate relations to the Patriarchs who had long since died when these words were spoken, if they themselves were not then living. Mark does not refer to the impression made upon the questioners by Jesus' reply, and only hints in his introduction of the next question at the impression made upon the multitude. On the other hand, Matthew states distinctly that the multitudes were "astonished at his teaching" (22 : 33). Luke, who through combination of Mark with special sources, has given a record of the incident varying greatly from Mark's, closes with the statement that certain of the Scribes, who were Pharisees and had doubtless taken keen satisfaction in the silencing of their rivals, said to Jesus "Master, thou hast well said"; for his triumph had been so complete that, as Luke adds, "they durst not any more ask him any question" (20 : 39f.). The question of the Scribe, therefore, which follows in Mark and Matthew cannot be understood as

28. And one of the scribes came, and heard them questioning together, and knowing that he had answered them well, asked him, What commandment is the first of all? Jesus answered, The first is, Hear, O Israel; ¹ The Lord our God, the Lord is one: and

¹ *The Lord is our God: the Lord is one.*

coming from the Sanhedrin, or as planned by the Scribe for entrapping Jesus in his reply. It was clear that there was no use in further attempting this sort of attack upon Jesus.

(9) *The Question of the Scribe, 12 : 28-34*

28. **One of the Scribes**—who had been present during the encounter with the Sadducees and had recognized that Jesus **had answered them well**, put to him a question which doubtless was not captious, but prompted by a genuine desire to get from this Teacher an opinion on a matter which, to people generally and particularly to him as a student of Scripture, was of great importance (see notes on ver. 34, below). Matthew who is not primary here—states that the Pharisees, who had not been present at the questioning, hearing of the discomfiture of their rivals, took counsel together and that the Scribe came from them to Jesus with a further tempting inquiry (22 : 34f.). Luke, having recorded a similar incident in the early part of his record of Jesus' last journey to Jerusalem (10 : 25-37), omits this incident here. **What** (lit. *what sort of*) **commandment is the first of all?** He did not ask for a definite precept which was to be placed before all the others, but for a class of precepts, or a representative precept, which would indicate the commanding line of life's obedience to God. Doubtless, the distinction between legal and moral commands, debated among the Schools, was in his mind. Note Jesus' own recognition of this distinction in the Sermon on the Mount, e.g. Matt. 5 : 21-48, and later, Matt. 15 : 1-20; 23 : 23.

29-31. **The first is:** This is meant in the general sense implied in the Scribe's question—the first, as the dominating direction of one's obedience. **Hear, O Israel**—the first part of the Jewish Confession of Faith, or *Shema*' (so called from the Hebrew word with which it begins), which was recited twice a day by every pious Jew and by the strictest of them carried about in the phylacteries (lit. *preservatives, amulets*) worn upon the forehead and the left arm (cf. Matt. 23 : 5), and formed part of every Synagogue service of worship (cf. Schürer, II, 2, pp. 84, 113). It consisted of the three passages, Deut. 6 : 4-9; 11 : 13-21; Num. 15 : 37-41. This, in Jesus' mind, is the commandment which comprises all the others, informs them all, gives to them

- thou shalt love the Lord thy God ¹ with all thy heart, and ¹ with all thy soul, and ¹ with all thy mind, and
31. ¹ with all thy strength. The second is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none
32. other commandment greater than these. And the scribe said unto him, Of a truth, Teacher, thou hast well said that he is one; and there is none other but
33. he: and to love him with all the heart, and with all the

¹ Grk. *from . . . from . . . from . . . from.*

all their regulating principle—the love of God by the whole man—the **heart**, as the centre and source generally of the whole inner thinking and feeling life, the **soul**, as the source specifically of the emotional living, the **mind**, of the intellectual living, the **strength**, of the forces, mental and physical, which call all this living forth and set it in action. **The second is this:** Jesus does not mean that this is subordinate to the other, but the natural corollary to it and its necessary expression—consequently, its essential equal (Matthew says, “like unto it,” 22 : 39). It is cited from Lev. 19 : 18; (cf. Jas. 2 : 8; Gal. 5 : 14; Rom. 13 : 9). **Thy neighbor**—in the Law, restricted to the fellow Jew, but, as shown by Jesus in the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk. 10 : 29-37) and in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5 : 43-48), used here in its widest sense. Jesus’ idea is that a man’s supreme love to God has not shown itself to be real until it has expressed itself, and that it has not really expressed itself until it has taken account of the relations in which man lives with his fellow man—in other words, that its expression in ceremony and worship, however exalted and spiritual, is not enough; because it does not reach its supremely regulative control of living, until it has moved out into the personal relations of life. Consequently, **there is none other commandment greater**—of more real importance and meaning to life—**than these**. Matthew phrases it, “On these two commandments the whole law hangeth and the prophets,” 22 : 40; cf. Matt. 7 : 12.

32, 33. **Of a truth, Teacher, thou hast well said** (lit. *Well said, Teacher! Of a truth thou hast said*): The significant thing in the Scribe’s acknowledgment of Jesus’ reply—which Mark alone gives—is not so much the enthusiasm with which he recognizes the masterliness of his interpretation of the Law, but the sympathy with which he enters into the principle on which it was based, as shown in his admission that to love God and to show that love in our relations to our fellow men are **much more**—something more excellent, worth

- understanding, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbor as himself, is much more than all whole
 34. burnt-offerings and sacrifices. And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God. And no man after that durst ask him any question.
 35. And Jesus answered and said, as he taught in the temple, How say the scribes that the Christ is the

while—**than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices**—a statement perfectly possible to one who, stimulated by such an insight into the Law as Jesus had shown, had been able to realize what the Prophets themselves had said (cf. 1 Sam. 15 : 22; Hosea 6 : 6; Micah 6 : 6-8; Ps. 51).

34. **Discreetly**—intelligently, with discernment of the truth involved in what Jesus had said. **Not far from the kingdom of God:** The receptivity of the Scribe to Jesus' teaching which brought him to the Master for this further instruction showed him to be open to those influences of the Spirit by which men were drawn, not only into Jesus' following, but personally into spiritual relationship with him. **No man . . . any question**—essentially the same statement as is made by Luke after the answer to the Sadducees (20 : 40), but phrased here so as to include personal as well as party questions, even though not captious in their spirit. For the Master's impressive statement to the Scribe that he was not far from the kingdom of God would, through its very solemnity, tend to close the further public questioning of Jesus, even by serious and earnest souls, as his crushing answers to the party delegations had taken from them all hope of hampering or of discrediting him through this mode of attack.

(10) *Jesus' Question, 12 : 35-37*

35-37. **Answered, as he taught:** Evidently, after the public questioning of him had ceased, Jesus turned again to his teaching of the people in the Temple, in which he had been interrupted by the Sanhedrists' challenge of his authority (11 : 27), and the later partisan attempts to entrap him in his speech (12 : 13, 18). In the progress of this teaching, he propounded a question about the Messiah's relations to David. Mark represents the question as stated generally, as part of the teaching. Matthew records it as having been put directly to the Pharisees, who apparently had come back into the audience after the discomfiture of their rivals (22 : 41). Luke gives it as asked of the Scribes who had approvingly acknowledged his

36. son of David? David himself said in the Holy Spirit,
 The Lord said unto my Lord,
 Sit thou on my right hand,
 Till I make thine enemies ¹ the footstool of thy feet.
37. David himself calleth him Lord; and whence is he
 his son? And the common people heard him gladly.

¹ Some MSS. read *underneath thy feet*.

conclusive reply to the Sadducean delegation (20 : 41). If Mark's view of the incident be correct, we cannot understand the question as having followed immediately upon the sincere inquiry of the Scribe regarding the great commandment, as though Jesus would criticize the understanding of Scripture represented by his query. It was doubtless put as a counter question to those that had been put to him; in order to show that those who had challenged him on the academic question of the consistency of Scripture with the idea of a future life were themselves open to challenge in their teaching of the all important theme of the Messiahship. **How say the Scribes—i.e.** How do they reconcile their statement **that the Christ is the son of David** with the statement by **David himself made in the Holy Spirit** (i.e. in the sphere of the Holy Spirit's influence, cf. Lk. 2 : 27; Rom. 8 : 9; 1 Cor. 12 : 3; Rev. 1 : 10) that he was his **Lord**? If the inspired word of the Psalmist be accepted as to the Messiah's Lordship over David, **whence** (i.e. from what reasoning, by what argument) **is he simply his son**? The significance of Jesus' query lies in the fact that the teaching of the Scribes—which was universally accepted among the people (cf. 10 : 47f.; Mt. 12 : 23; 15 : 22; 21 : 9, 15)—made the important thing about the Messiah his lineage from David, not so much in the way of accrediting his ancestry, as in asserting the political purpose of his ministry to restore the royal kingdom to Israel (cf. 11 : 10; Acts 1 : 6). In emphasizing this relationship of the Messiah to David and gathering around it all their Messianic hopes, they had utterly lost sight of that other and immeasurably more significant relationship which David himself acknowledges in this generally accepted Messianic Psalm (110 : 1)—that the Messiah was his Lord, supremely greater than himself, seated by Jehovah at his own **right hand**, while his **enemies** were being subdued under his **feet**. It was, therefore, not so much to place before the people a puzzle for the Scribes, nor merely to discredit them as authoritative interpreters of the Scriptures, but to disclose to both Scribes and people the teachings of Scripture itself as to the Messiah—the teachings which gave significance to the claims

38. And in his teaching he said, Beware of the scribes,
 who desire to walk in long robes, and *to have saluta-*
 39. tions in the marketplaces, and chief seats in the syna-
 40. gogues, and chief places at feasts: they that devour
 widows' houses,¹ and for a pretence make long prayers;
 these shall receive greater condemnation.

¹ *even while for a pretence they make.*

he had already made before them and which they had been so quick to resent as blasphemous (cf. Jn. 5 : 18; 8 : 58f.; 10 : 29-33). Jesus' reference to David as the author of this Psalm was in accordance with the general understanding and belief of his day. An acquaintance with the facts of modern critical scholarship is not necessarily to be attributed to Jesus, any more than a familiarity with the facts of modern science. It was in the realm of the moral and the spiritual that Jesus was conscious of a relationship to God that isolated him from humanity around him, however his unfathomable sympathy and love identified him with it. **The common people** (lit. *the great multitude*, present at the Feast) **heard him gladly**: This refers to his general teaching in the Temple that day, and not merely to this particular question which he had propounded. Its dominant character was doubtless controversial, as represented by the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel; but there must have been much in it that appealed to the heart of the people, who as sheep without a shepherd were groping for the way of life. (See Jn. 12 : 20-50, which records some of his teaching on this day—particularly vs. 26, 32, 35f., 46f.). Matthew closes his record of this question with the statement that no one was able to answer it, and follows this with the general statement, which Luke places after the discomfiture of the Sadducees (20 : 40) and Mark after the commendation of the Scribe (ver. 34), that no man dared "from that day forth [to] ask him any questions" (22 : 45). It doubtless confirmed beyond all doubt the impression already made on friends and foes of the unassailable superiority of Jesus in the interpretation of Scripture.

(11) *The Warning Against the Scribes, 12 : 38-40*

38-40. **In his teaching**—as it continued after the propounding of this unanswered and unanswerable question (cf. Lk. 20 : 45f.). **Beware of the Scribes**: This warning was most likely suggested by the fact, which his question had disclosed, of the misleading and truth-obscuring teaching of the Scribes. This teaching was not due merely to ignorance of the Scriptures, which would have been serious enough,

41. And he sat down over against the treasury, and beheld how the multitude cast money into the treas-

but to the personal character which had come to centre everything upon themselves and their position among the people, until religion had lost all reality in their lives and the religious idea of the Messiah had disappeared wholly from their thoughts. **Long robes**—worn by persons of rank and distinction (cf. 16 : 5; Lk. 15 : 22; Rev. 6 : 11) and assumed by the Scribes out of pure ostentation (cf. Matt. 23 : 5). **Salutations in the marketplaces**—particularly such titles as Rabbi (teacher) and Abba (father) and Moreh (Master [lit. *guide*], cf. Matt. 23 : 7-10, as ministering to their self-glorifying pride. **Chief seats in the Synagogues**—the seats which were reserved for the rulers of the Synagogue and persons of distinction, in front of the ark containing the Law, and which faced the congregation (Edersheim, *Jesus*, I, p. 436). **Chief places at feasts**—probably the middle divan, or couch, at the head of the three sided table around which the guests reclined (cf. Matt. 23 : 6; also Lk. 14 : 7-11; also Edersheim, *Jesus*, II, p. 207). **Devour widows' houses**—property, the wealth or property belonging to the household, which possibly as followers of these Teachers the widows bestowed upon them for their support (cf. Lk. 8 : 2f.), and which they greedily wasted (cf. Lk. 15 : 30), in direct disobedience of the specific command of the Law that widows should not be afflicted (Ex. 22 : 22). **For a pretence**—as a covering under which they sought to hide their iniquity, (Matthew alone preserves this denunciation in its extended form, 23 : 1-36; though Luke has reproduced a considerable portion of it in the early part of his record of the last journey to Jerusalem, doubtless from sources special to himself, 11 : 42-52).

(12) *The Widow's Mite*, 12 : 41-44

41. **Sat down**—not so much to rest himself from his teaching, since as a teacher he had been seated all the while (cf. Matt. 26 : 55; 5 : 1f.; 13 : 1f.), but to take a place of observation, where he could see **how the multitude cast money** (lit. *bronze*) **into the treasury**. The teaching had taken place probably in the Court of the Gentiles (cf. Jn. 8 : 20 with 12 : 20). After it was over, Jesus had passed into the inner Court of the Women, under the Colonnade around whose walls were placed the trumpet mouthed chests to receive the offerings of the people. This Colonnade was called the treasury (lit. *the treasure-hold*, cf. Jn. 8 : 20). Attracted perhaps by the people moving towards the Colonnade and by the rattle of the money as it was dropped into the chests, Jesus sits down to observe the givers in what they were doing. **Many . . . rich cast in much**: The people generally gave the smaller bronze-copper coins (such as the "farthing,"

42. ury: and many that were rich cast in much. And there came ¹ a poor widow, and she cast in two mites, 43. which make a farthing. And he called unto him his disciples, and said unto them, Verily I say unto you, This poor widow cast in more than all they that are 44. casting into the treasury: for they all did cast in of their superfluity; but she of her want did cast in all that she had, *even* all her living.
13. And as he went forth out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Teacher, behold, what man-

¹ Grk. *one*.

or *quadrans*, equivalent to $\frac{1}{2}$ cent, Matt. 5 : 26); the rich, the larger silver coins (such as the "shilling" or *denarius* [12 : 15], equivalent to about 20 cents, 6 : 37; 14 : 5).

42-44. **A poor widow**—significant, in view of the widows just referred to by the Master who were reduced to poverty through their support of the Scribes (ver. 40). **Two mites**—the smallest Greek coin in circulation, equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ *quadrans* ("farthing"), or $\frac{3}{20}$ cent—**which (two) make a farthing**—the smallest Roman coin. Jesus' commendation of her gift, as **more than** was given by **all those that were casting into the treasury**, was not in contrast to its size, since, in all likelihood, being, in its total value, a farthing, it was as large as many other offerings, but in contrast to its spirit, since, in spite of **her want**, it was a giving of **all that she had—all her living**, *i.e.* all she had to live upon until more was earned (Swete, *ad. loc.*, cf. Lk. 8 : 43; 15 : 12, 30). From the way in which the gifts were exposed in the act of giving, Jesus might easily have observed the amount of her gift; from her dress and general appearance, he might readily have surmised her extreme poverty; but it was his divine insight into the heart that disclosed to him the spirit of her giving and the veritableness of the sacrifice the gift was costing her. It may have been that while Jesus was here the Greeks made inquiry for him (Jn. 12 : 20-22). Being Gentiles, they could not enter the Court of the Women, which would explain the fact that Jesus' reply does not seem to have been addressed to them or in their presence (ver. 23).

(13) *The Apocalyptic Discourse*, 13 : 1-37

1, 2. **He went forth out of the temple**: This was his final departure from the Temple, and marks the close of his public teaching (cf.

2. ner of stones and what manner of buildings! And Jesus said unto him, Seest thou these great buildings? there shall not be left here one stone upon another, which shall not be thrown down.
3. And as he sat on the mount of Olives over against the temple, Peter and ¹ James and John and Andrew

¹ *Jacob.*

Jn. 12 : 36b, vs. 44-50 having been transposed from their proper place between 36a and 36b). **One of his disciples:** We are not told which one; but the very fact that he is not named would seem to indicate that he was not one of the group who came to the Master for private information as to the details of the prophetic statement he had made, and that his remark was more or less casual. **What manner of stones . . . buildings:** Matthew implies (24 : 1) that he was on his way to Bethany at the close of the day when this remark was made to him. This would be quite possible; since, as the road passed up the farther side of the Kedron Valley, the Temple in all its glory would lie before their gaze. (See description from this place of view in Tacitus, *Hist.*, v. 8). The substructure, on the South side, and the outside enclosing walls had been built by Herod out of huge blocks of stone whose dimensions, according to Josephus (*Ant.* xv : 11,3, *Jewish War*, v : 5,5), almost surpass belief; while the whole area of the Temple itself was surrounded by double rows of monolithic columns, quadruple on the South side. The Temple building was constructed of blocks of white marble, richly ornamented with gold (cf. Lk. 21 : 5). Possibly the Master's reference to the coming desolation of the city in the closing words of his discourse against the Scribes (Matt. 23 : 38) had stirred the disciples to dwell upon the beauty and magnificence of this its great building and to call the Master's attention to what seemed to them impossible of such a portentous future. **Shall not be left . . . one stone upon another**—a prophetic figure of utter destruction (cf. 2 Sam. 17 : 13; Lam. 4 : 1; Mic. 1 : 6) and yet fulfilled in the case of the Temple to an extent appallingly significant when what is left of it is compared with the extensive remains of many temples of antiquity (cf. Milman, *History of the Jews*, II, p. 16).

3, 4. As they come to the top of the ascent of the **mount of Olives** and the Master seats himself, perhaps to rest, while still in full view of the Temple, **Peter and James and John and Andrew**—the first four of the Apostolic list, according to Mark (3 : 16f.)—came to him **privately**—apart from the rest—and **asked him when this destruc-**

4. asked him privately, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what *shall be* the sign when these things are

tion was to take place and **what** was to be **the sign** that should usher in its accomplishment. If they had been disturbed by his general reference to the coming desolation of the City (Matt. 23 : 38), his specific prediction of the utter destruction of the magnificent Temple had caused them deep distress and they come to him, doubtless deputed by the rest, to learn more of this catastrophe which he has in view. Matthew, in order to make the question agree with the answer, expands it so as to include an inquiry as to the Master's second coming and the general end of the Age (24 : 3). Luke follows Mark in confining the question to the Master's prediction of the destruction of the Temple (21 : 7). It is evident that in the discourse which follows it is the signs that are first referred to (vs. 5-14a)—and that largely by way of warning against being led astray by signs that are false (vs. 5-8)—and also counsel as to the obligations to be recognized and the encouragements to be had in the coming emergencies (vs. 11-13). Such reference to a definite sign as is made is confined to the vague statement of ver. 14a—a statement suggested doubtless by such passages in the Book of Daniel as 9 : 27; 11 : 31; 12 : 11; while the reference to the city's overthrow which follows (vs. 14b-23) consists of warnings uttered in view, not only of the need of immediate action when the catastrophe should appear, but of the severity of the event itself and of the danger which it would bring with it of being led astray by rumors or representations of the returning Christ.

It is further evident that this answer to the disciples' question is expanded into an announcement of the Coming of the Son of Man and his gathering to himself of his elect, with the portents that are to precede this event (vs. 24-27), which is followed by a warning to take heed to these signs, accompanied by a reminder that all these things are to take place within the then present generation, and a consequent exhortation to be watchful for their coming (vs. 28-37).

The interpretation of this discourse is confessedly difficult, even with all allowance for the hyperbole and imagery characteristic of apocalyptic utterance, and the recognition of the fact that its purpose is ethical rather than predictive—to warn and encourage the followers of the new religion in the time of their perplexity and distress, rather than to give them beforehand a program of events. It would seem, in fact, that the discourse could be properly understood only when it is realized that however natural it was for the Master, facing as he did the tragic closing of his life's work, to warn and encourage his disciples regarding the future to an extent he had not done before, the tendency on the part of the early Church to elaborate

5. all about to be accomplished? And Jesus began to say unto them, Take heed that no man lead you
6. astray. Many shall come in my name, saying, I

any such prophetic utterances would be equally natural, especially as events pointed towards the coming of the announced catastrophe. It is probable, therefore, that we have in this chapter a warning and encouraging discourse of Jesus regarding the future, as that future was related to the destruction of the Jewish national religion, but with more or less apocalyptic elaborations introduced into it by the early Church, which would account for its extended length—a characteristic that does not belong to Jesus' discourses in Mark. In this form it may have circulated as an individual apocalypse among the Christian communities (see ver. 14), and as such been incorporated by Mark in his narrative, this Evangelist having it in a less elaborated form, more nearly representing Jesus' own utterances than either Matthew or Luke. (For other instances of the interpretation of original utterances in the light of the thought of the early Church, see notes on 1 : 4 and 4 : 12.)

5-13. **Take heed that no man lead you astray:** The warning with which the discourse opens is directed against the influences of those who would falsely represent themselves as the Returned Messiah and seek to lead his followers away from the truth. This warning is repeated in ver. 22 and is quite intelligible as expressing the anxiety of the Church under the pressure of the emergencies in which the Christian communities found themselves as the catastrophe drew near (cf. Milman, *History of the Jews*, II, p. 371). These emergencies are more definitely described in the following reference to **wars and rumors of wars**, which, having in themselves no misleading influences, were not to be feared, but to be accepted in a patient self-possession of soul as the things which **must needs come to pass** before the consummation is reached (cf. 2 Thess. 2 : 1-3). **Nation shall rise against nation . . . earthquakes . . . famines:** These expressions were common to prophetic and apocalyptic announcements of the judgments of God (cf. Isa. 8 : 21; 13 : 13; 14 : 30; Jer. 23 : 19; Ezek. 5 : 12; Rev. 6 : 8; 11 : 13; 18 : 8; *Enoch* 1 : 6; 4 *Esdras*, 16 : 36-40), but are used here to carry out the assurance of the preceding statement and to make clear that these disturbances are not the ending, but only the **beginning of travail** (lit. *throes, pangs*)—the technical phrase in Rabbinical literature and in popular use, for the calamities which were to usher in the Messianic age (cf. Mic. 4 : 9f.; Isa. 66 : 7-9). As the references to the misleading doctrinal influences are easily understood as representing the anxiety of the early Church, so these references to outward disturbances are intelligible as repre-

7. am *he*; and shall lead many astray. And when ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars, be not troubled: *these things* must needs come to pass; but the end is
8. not yet. For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; there shall be earthquakes in divers places; there shall be famines: these things are the beginning of travail.

senting the Church's confidence in the midst of the political outbreaks, the national unrest, the earthquakes and famines throughout the Roman Empire preceding the Jewish War (cf. Tacitus, *History*, I : 2). They have too strong a color of those times to be attributed to the Master's own discourse, in view of his express statement that the definite announcement of the day and hour when these things should come to pass did not belong to what he had to say (ver. 32). On the other hand, the passage which follows, however (vs. 9-13), belongs clearly to his manner and habit of disclosing to his disciples what the future is to bring to them and doubtless forms part of his discourse. Only a portion of this passage appears in Matthew's account (but cf. Matt. 10 : 17-22), and this very much amplified (24 : 9-14), and while it is paralleled by Luke, it is in a more elaborated form (21 : 12-19). **Take heed to yourselves** (lit. *you, yourselves*): It is their personal relation to and their personal behavior in these coming trials which he has most in mind and regarding which he most wishes to put them on their guard and give them encouragement and cheer. This was more important than the studying of signs and portents, and was the essential thing in the service they were to render to his cause (cf. Lk. 17 : 1-3). **Deliver you to councils and in** (lit. *to*) **synagogues shall ye** (properly, *ye shall*) **be beaten and before governors and kings shall ye stand**: Those who were to "deliver" them are stated in ver. 12. The "councils" include, not only the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem, but the tribunals in the various towns and villages, consisting of the Elders of the local Synagogues, in which the sentences were executed (cf. Schürer, II : ii, pp. 60-62). The "governors and kings" comprise, obviously, the Roman officials, not only within but outside Palestine, including the Emperor himself. Such a forecast as this was perfectly possible on the Master's part, in view of what he had foreseen was inevitable in his own case with the Jewish rulers. As his disciples should proclaim and live his spiritual religion, they would be subjected, as he was, to persecution by the ceremonial and materialistic Jews, which would involve more or less oppressive action on the part of the civil authorities (cf. 8 :

9. But take ye heed to yourselves: for they shall deliver you up to councils; and in synagogues shall ye be beaten; and before governors and kings shall ye stand for my sake, for a testimony unto them. And the gospel must first be preached unto all the nations.
11. And when they lead you *to judgment*, and deliver you up, be not anxious beforehand what ye shall speak: but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye; for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy

31-35; 10 : 33-40). **For a testimony unto them:** Their defence before the civil authorities would be in itself a proclamation to them of the cause they represented (cf. 1 : 44; 6 : 11). Luke's idea is that their defence will be a testimony to their own character and life (21 : 13). For the realization of this forecast in the experiences of the early church, one needs but to recall such incidents as are recorded in Acts 4 : 1-22; 5 : 17-40; 6 : 8-15; 7 : 54-60; 8 : 1-3; 12 : 1f.; 13 : 7-12, 50; 14 : 5, 19; 16 : 19-23; 36-39; 18 : 12-17; 21 : 27-33; 22 : 30; 24 : 1-25; 25 : 1-12; 26 : 1-32, and such intimations in the Epistles as Jas. 2 : 6; 2 Cor. 11 : 23-27; 2 Tim. 4 : 16f. **The Gospel must first be preached unto all nations**—not as a sign, but as a duty of their discipleship (cf. Matt. 10 : 23). Matthew, who reproduces this verse in his record of the discourse, 24 : 14, adds in a later apocalyptic spirit "and then shall the end come." **Be not anxious** (lit. distracted by anxiety) **beforehand what ye shall speak:** The reference is primarily to their defence, involved in which, of course, is a reference to the resultant testimony to the Gospel. Luke says, "Settle . . . not to meditate beforehand how to answer" (21 : 14). **Not ye that speak, but the Holy Spirit** (Luke refers to the Master himself as the one who will direct their answer, 21 : 15): This is not in the sense of a verbal inspiration, but of a divine suggestion of thought and speech (cf. Jn. 16 : 13f.). For realization of this promise, see Acts 4 : 8; 13 : 9; Rom. 15 : 19; 1 Cor. 2 : 4. **Brother shall deliver up brother . . . and the father his child; and children shall rise up against parents:** The bitterest part of their experiences will be the estrangement and persecution to be endured at the hands of their own kinsfolk—an element that the Master must have only too well foreseen from what he himself had already experienced from his family (see notes on 3 : 21) and was about to experience from the circle of his chosen discipleship (cf. 14 : 10, 17-21, 41-45). It was an experience which rested in and resulted from the profound spiritual

12. Spirit. And brother shall deliver up brother to death, and the father his child; and children shall rise up against parents, and ¹ cause them to be put to death.
13. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved.
14. But when ye see the abomination of desolation

¹ put them to death.

principles which were to control the disciples' living (cf. 10 : 29f.; Lk. 14 : 26; Matt. 10 : 34-37, and see notes on 3 : 33-35), and would necessarily affect their relationship with all the world, to the extent of their being **hated of all men for his name's sake**. This was not to be because of any mere partisanship on the disciples' part, but because of the necessary fundamental conflict between the spiritual claims on character and life which they asserted and the natural rebellion against these claims by the human heart (cf. Jn. 7 : 7; 15 : 18-24; 16 : 2f.; 17 : 14). Matthew, who reproduces this verse in his record of the discourse, 24 : 9, 13, confines the enmity to the Gentiles. For the realization of this in the experience of the early disciples, see Acts 4 : 17; 5 : 41; 9 : 14; 26 : 9. **He that endureth to the end shall be saved**—in the sense of 8 : 35, as is evident from Luke's paraphrase, "In your patience (lit. *enduring*) ye shall win your souls (lit. *lives*)" 21 : 19, though from the statement with which he prefaces it (ver. 18), it would seem that he understood these "lives" in the sense of bodily lives. The Master's meaning, however, is clearly that those who should endure to the bitter end of death, might lose their physical lives, but would preserve the higher spiritual life, which was their essential possession (see notes on 8 : 35-37). While Matthew does not have this passage in his record of this discourse, he reproduces vs. 9, 11-13 almost literally in his record of the Master's instructions to the Twelve for their preaching tour (10 : 17-22), and Luke, though he parallels the passage in general, has additional traces of it in an earlier discourse (12 : 7, 11f.).

14-23. The following passage is in general a return to the apocalyptic point of view and, with the exception of certain expressions, is not attributable to the Master, either in this discourse or on other occasions. It has the ring of an impending catastrophe and a foreboding of national disaster such as would be natural as the Jewish war drew towards its close. **The abomination of desolation** (lit. *the abomination that is characterized by desolation, i.e. that brings desolation with it*): This phrase, as distinctly stated by Matthew (24 : 15), is

standing where he ought not (let him that readeth understand), then let them that are in Judæa flee
 15. unto the mountains: and let him that is on the house-
 top not go down, nor enter in, to take anything out
 16. of his house: and let him that is in the field not return
 17. back to take his cloak. But woe unto them that are
 with child and to them that give suck in those days!

taken from Dan. 11 : 31; 12 : 11 (cf. 9 : 27), where the reference is doubtless to the erection by Antiochus Epiphanes (168 B.C.) of an altar to Zeus on the altar of burnt offering in the Temple (cf. 1 Mac. 1 : 54), an event which had come to be regarded by the Jews as the type and symbol of the most absolute and utter desecration of their religion and thus of the most awful and desolating thing that could happen to them. In view of the fact that in the year 38 A.D. the threat was made to erect the statue of Caligula in the Temple, this phrase is used here possibly as indicating the belief that there would be another supreme defilement of the holy building which would mark the culmination of the conflict between the Romans and the Jews (Luke, who writes after the fall of Jerusalem, interprets it as referring to the Roman army, which lay siege to the city, and thus threatened her desolation, 21 : 20; cf. 19 : 43f.). **Let him that readeth understand** (reproduced by Matthew, 24 : 15; omitted by Luke, 21 : 20f.)—a parenthetical phrase, belonging to the apocalyptic document which Mark incorporated into his narrative. It calls attention to the significance of the sign just given and is distinctively in the spirit of apocalyptic writing (cf. Rev. 13 : 18). **Let them that are in Judæa flee unto the mountains:** When this confidently expected defilement of the Temple came to pass, it was to be taken as a signal for an instant flight from the City, the impelling haste of which is impressed upon them by the characteristic instructions which follow. They who might be at rest or in prayer on **the housetop** were not to go down nor enter into the house **to take anything** out of it, but to flee at once over the housetops themselves to the place of refuge; they who were at work in the field were not to go back even to where they had laid aside their outer garments, to get them for a covering in their flight, but to escape in utmost haste without thought of anything but safety. Luke reproduces these directions in connection with his record of Jesus' answer to the query of the Pharisees as to when the kingdom of God was to come (17 : 31). He tells his disciples that, while the kingdom of God was not a thing of outward observation, the coming of the Son of Man would be an event clearly discernible

18. And pray ye that it be not in the winter. For those
 19. days shall be tribulation, such as there hath not been
 the like from the beginning of the creation which
 20. God created until now, and never shall be. And ex-
 cept the Lord had shortened the days, no flesh would
 have been saved; but for the elect's sake, whom he
 21. chose, he shortened the days. And then if any man
 shall say unto you, Lo, here is the Christ; or, Lo, there;
 22. believe ¹ *it* not: for there shall arise false Christs and
 false prophets, and shall show signs and wonders,
 23. that they may lead astray, if possible, the elect. But

¹ *him.*

by all, and from the destruction accompanying it they would be able to save themselves only by indifference to worldly interests. It is likely that these directions belonged originally to this discourse of the Master's given by Luke, from which they were incorporated into this apocalypse used by Mark. In this transposing of them, however, their primary reference to the ethical attitude of the disciples towards worldly interests has been changed to a reference to the immediateness of their flight. Luke extends this by calling attention to the divine justice which will be the moving power behind the event (21 : 22). **Woe unto them that are with child:** The terribleness of the emergency in which they are to be placed is heightened by a reference to the misery of the women who would find it impossible to flee (cf. Lk. 23 : 28f., on which this "woe" may have been based). **Pray ye that it be not in the winter** (Matthew in a later legalistic spirit adds "neither on a Sabbath," 24 : 20)—*i.e.* in January and February, when the conditions of flight would be more severe through the cold and the rain. **Those days shall be tribulation** (*i.e.* will constitute a tribulation) **such as there hath not been . . . from the beginning of creation . . . until now, and never shall be** (shortened in form and lessened in force by Luke, 21 : 23b): The details are now merged in a general statement of the severity of the impending disaster, which is given in exaggerated terms, common in apocalyptic writing (cf. Dan. 12 : 1; Rev. 16 : 18). **Except the Lord had shortened the days, no flesh would have been saved** (omitted by Luke)—the form of the statement being put in the past, as from the viewpoint of the Eternal decrees, and the statement itself adding to the description of the unparalleled agony of the coming catastrophe. **For the elect's**

take ye heed: behold, I have told you all things beforehand.

24. But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall

sake (omitted by Luke)—the “remnant,” which figures in apocalyptic writings as those who are to be graciously preserved from the tribulation (cf. Rev. 17 : 14; Joel 2 : 32; *Enoch* 1 : 1). **Lo, here is the Christ; or Lo, there; believe it not:** These words belong probably to the Master’s parousia discourse in Lk. 17 : 23-37, from which they have been incorporated into this apocalypse used by Mark. In Luke the caution against following the false leadings is supplemented by the assurance that the appearance of the Son of Man will be clear and unmistakable to all. Here there is nothing to relieve the outlook. **The false Christs and the false prophets will show signs and wonders,** with the purpose to lead astray, if possible, the elect. We have here, as in ver. 6, an expression of the anxiety of the Early Church against the possibilities of defection under the stress and strain of the impending disaster (cf. 2 Thess. 2 : 9-12). Matthew has extended this warning with words which sound as though they may have come from the Master on some occasion similar to that in Lk. 17 ch. To these words he has added other portions of Luke’s parousia discourse (24 : 26-28). **Take ye heed . . . I have told you all things beforehand**—a fitting close to this apocalyptic passage, in its assurance that the warnings given are abundantly sufficient to prevent the elect from being led astray.

24-27. The following passage, in its setting of celestial portents (ver. 24f.) is apocalyptic, representing the conviction of the Early Church as to the manner in which was to be ushered in the day of the Lord which was to mark his return to earth, but in its announcement of the fact of that return and its sequence (ver. 26f.) it is unmistakably an utterance of the Master himself in this discourse, paralleled by what he had said before (cf. 8 : 38; Matt. 13 : 41-43) and by what he was to say later (cf. 14 : 62; Matt. 25 : 31f.; 26 : 64). These two elements of our passage were combined in the apocalypse before it was incorporated by Mark. **In those days**—the period just referred to which is to witness the City’s overthrow, but **after that tribulation** (Matthew says “immediately,” 24 : 29. Luke has no note of time, 21 : 25). **The sun shall be darkened:** These celestial disturbances are not to be taken literally, but as the imaginative language of apocalyptic description, derived from Jewish prophecy (cf. Joel 2 : 30f.; Isa. 13 : 9f.; 24 : 21-23; 34 : 4; Zeph. 1 : 14f.; cf. also Rev. 6 : 12-14; 2 Pet. 3 : 10-12). **The Powers that are in the heavens**—the heavenly bodies generally, referred to in Isa. 34 : 4 as “the host of heaven” (cf. also Deut. 4 : 19; Neh. 9 : 6; Ps. 33 : 6;

25. be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall be falling from heaven, and the powers
 26. that are in the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in clouds with
 27. great power and glory. And then shall he send forth the angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven.
 28. Now from the fig tree learn her parable: when her

Isa. 40 : 26; 45 : 12; Jer. 33 : 22; Dan. 8 : 10). **Then shall they see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory:** This description seems to be intended in a sense more literal than that of the disturbance of the heavenly bodies (cf. Acts 1 : 11; 1 Thess. 4 : 15-17). It is adopted by the Master obviously from the passage in Daniel which describes the establishment of the kingdom of the "Son of man" (7 : 13f.) and is used here to describe in Old Testament apocalyptic terms familiar to the disciples the final consummation of his kingdom (cf. Rev. 1 : 7; 14 : 14). This passage doubtless lies behind his earlier and later references to this event (cf. 8 : 38; 14 : 62; Matt. 25 : 31f.; 26 : 64). In view of the explicit statement of ver. 32, no inference can be drawn as to how closely Jesus expected his return to be connected with the destruction of Jerusalem, though it would seem from ver. 30 that he looked for it within his generation. **Then shall he send forth his angels**—as his ministering servants (cf. Matt. 13 : 41f.; Heb. 1 : 13f.), based, doubtless, on Dan. 7 : 10 (cf. 1 : 13; Jn. 1 : 51). **His elect**—recast in later apocalyptic phrase from the simpler expression "the righteous," used by the Master in his explanation of the parable of the Tares (Matt. 13 : 43). **From the four winds . . . the uttermost part** (lit. *point*) **of earth . . . heaven**—an enlargement, probably by the Master himself, of his statement in connection with the healing of the Centurion's servant (Matt. 8 : 11) and based, perhaps, on Deut. 30 : 4 and the LXX of Zech. 2 : 6. Both Matthew and Luke have amplified this passage (vs. 24-27) with later apocalyptic phrases, which may or may not have been in the apocalypse used by Mark. Luke, on the other hand, has no reference to the gathering together of the elect (cf. Matt. 24 : 29-31; Lk. 21 : 25-28).

28-37. The remainder of the chapter follows as an exhortation to the disciples to be ready for these events, and shows itself clearly to be from the Master himself. It formed the closing portion of the

branch is now become tender, and putteth forth its
 29. leaves, ye know that the summer is nigh; even so ye
 also, when ye see these things coming to pass, know
 30. ye that ¹ he is nigh, *even* at the doors. Verily I say
 unto you, This generation shall not pass away, until
 31. all these things be accomplished. Heaven and earth
 shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away.

¹ *it.*

apocalyptic writing which Mark has incorporated here into his narrative. **From the fig tree learn her parable** (*i.e.* the analogy it offers for illustration): Unlike the one exceptional fig tree on the way from Bethany, which he made an object lesson to the disciples of the religious fruitlessness of the Jewish nation, it is here the general class of fig trees which he uses in the normal functions of their life to make clear the development which is to lead up to this great catastrophe. **Tender:** The reference here is to the softening of the branch through the flowing of the sap, the result of which is the bursting of the buds and the unfolding of the leaves. The Master was speaking at the Passover time, when the new leaves would be appearing. But when this stage of the process is reached, everyone knows **that the summer is nigh**. **When ye see these things** (Matthew enlarges by saying "all these things," 24 : 33) **coming to pass, know ye that he** (better, *it*. Note Luke's substitution, "the kingdom of God," 21 : 31) **is nigh, even at the doors:** The things the Master had in mind are obviously not either the wars and earthquakes and famines, which the apocalypse sets down as the beginning of the woes (ver. 7f.), or the appearance of the abomination of desolation, which is the sign of their culmination (ver. 14), or even the celestial disturbances which are to usher in the final and (ver. 24f.)—the analogy of a process of life which he has chosen in the fig tree forbids, in fact, a reference to anything but the development of the age in which they were living. The Master's meaning, therefore—quite in keeping with the spirit of vs. 9-13—is that the disciples do not need specific signs to tell them when this catastrophe is to take place (ver. 4)—that an ordinary appreciation of what is going on in the world around them will disclose to them the coming of this event. In other words, when they see the spirit of hatred and enmity—of which he had forewarned them in vs. 9-13—coming to its unbridled expression, they might understand that the hour of judgment against their persecutors was drawing near.

By its amplification of the Master's discourse, this apocalypse has

32. But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.
33. Take ye heed, watch ¹ and pray: for ye known not
34. when the time is. *It is as when* a man, sojourning in another country, having left his house, and given authority to his ² servants, to each one his work, com-

¹ Some MSS. omit *and pray*.² Crk. *bondservants*.

lost the original reference of "these things" and has made them refer to the specific signs which it had introduced into the forecast and which had been suggested by the pressure of the times in which it was composed. **This generation shall not pass away until all these things shall be accomplished:** There can be no question that the Master's belief was that not only the bitter hatred of his spiritual message to the Jewish people would reach its culmination in the judicial overthrow of the Holy City within the generation in which they were living, but that within this same period would occur his own return in the triumph of his kingdom in the world (see notes on 8 : 34 and 9 : 1). This statement cannot rationally be understood in any other way (cf. 8 : 12, 38; Matt. 11 : 16f.; 12 : 41f.; Lk. 17 : 25; particularly Matt. 23 : 36). That this triumph would occur, he knew with the divine certainty of his knowledge of the conquest his message and mission would have over the human race. **Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away** (cf. Isa. 51 : 6). **But**, in answer to the first part of the disciples' question (ver. 4), **of that day or that hour**, when this judgment should take place and this triumph follow, **knoweth no man, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son** (as he is on earth, cf. Matt. 11 : 27; Jn. 5 : 19f.; 6 : 40; 17 : 1; 1 Jn. 2 : 22f.); because it was dependent, not only upon the untimed working out of the enmity of the human heart against the love of God, but upon the even less timed outworking of the human will in its acceptance of that love. In his human conditions, Jesus was limited in his knowledge of this time element in the relations of the heart and will of man to the love of God. That was understood and known by no one **but the Father**. (See Hogg, *Christ's Message of the Kingdom* p. 42f.) Consequently, he has but one thing to urge upon the disciples—the need of giving heed to their personal lives, as those lives expressed themselves in their work (ver. 33), and of being watchful of the signs of the times (Mark's added phrase, "and pray," is not part of the text); for there was no way in which, ignorant as they were of the day and the hour

35. manded also the porter to watch. Watch therefore: for ye know not when the lord of the house cometh, whether at even, or at midnight, or at cockcrowing, 36. or in the morning; lest coming suddenly he find you 37. sleeping. And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch.

III. THE PASSION AND RESURRECTION, 14 : 1-16 : 8

14. Now after two days was *the feast of the passover* and the unleavened bread: and the chief priests and

of this event, they could calculate ahead when it was to occur. He was the householder who, for a time, would be **sojourning in another** (heavenly) **country**, with his household left in charge of his **servants**. Each one of the servants had **his work** given to him to do, and their chief responsibility would be the accomplishing of their appointed tasks. But these tasks involved the duty of a porter—which is significant here, because of the similar duty belonging to the Temple guards (cf. Edersheim, *Temple*, p. 120)—to open the door to the **lord of the house** when he **cometh, whether at even, or at midnight, or at cockcrowing, or in the morning** (the popular expressions for the four Roman night watches from six to six). Together, therefore, with the natural command to take heed to the work of their lives, there was the other needful command to watch, **lest coming suddenly** (not capriciously on the **part** of the householder, but unexpectedly to the servants) the **lord of the house** find them **sleeping**—neglectful of their duty with reference to his promised return—in other words, careless of the relation of their work to the triumph of the kingdom (cf. Matt. 24 : 45-51; Lk. 12 : 42-46, and the following parables in Matthew, ch. 25). Naturally, this command to these four disciples was one to be made, not only to the rest of the Twelve, but to all who were his disciples. This passage (vs. 28-37) is largely extended by Matthew (24 : 32-51) with utterances of the Master found in two discourses given in Luke's record of the Journey to Jerusalem (12 : 39f.; 42-46; 17 : 26f., 34f.), and is then supplemented with the Parable of the Ten Virgins (25 : 1-13), the Parable of the Talents (25 : 14-30), and the depiction of the Judgment Day (25 : 31-46). On the other hand, Luke omits from the first part of the passage the significant statement about the knowledge of the day and hour of the coming events (ver. 32), and greatly modifies the contents of the second part (21 : 34-36).

This closes the record of Tuesday of Holy Week.

- the scribes sought how they might take him with
2. subtlety, and kill him: for they said, Not during the feast, lest haply there shall be a tumult of the people.
 3. And while he was in Bethany in the house of Simon

(1) *The Conspiracy of the Rulers, the Supper at Bethany, and the Treachery of Judas, 14: 1-11*

14: 1, 2. **After two days was the feast of the passover and the unleavened bread:** The entire festival of seven days, beginning with the Passover Meal and continuing through the week of unfermented bread, is here referred to by this double title (given only by Mark; cf. 1 Esdras 1: 17). The phrase, "after two days," would place the opening meal, according to Jewish reckoning, on the next day. As this meal took place on the 14th Nisan (the first month in the Jewish year), the day of our passage would be the 13th, or Wednesday of Holy Week. The festival was intended to commemorate the hurried departure of the Hebrews from Egypt, and was distinctively the people's national feast (Ex. 12: 1-28). The fact that this is the first mention of the feast in the Synoptic record of this week brings out into clear light Jesus' motive in leaving Galilee and coming into Judæa and to Jerusalem. It was not to attend the feasts at which he had already been present (Jn. 7: 2; 10: 22) or this one now at hand, but to face the inevitable ending of his mission, of which he had been convinced from the beginning (see notes on 2: 12; cf. also Jn. 2: 19) and which now, since the alienation of the people in Galilee from his spiritual message, and the increasing hostility of the Jerusalem leaders to his spiritual claims, had become a certainty of impending nearness. **Sought how they might take him with subtlety** (lit. *with craft*) **and kill him:** Matthew informs us that they met in the house of Caiaphas (26: 3), who had already advocated the policy of sacrificing Jesus in the interest of their relations to the Roman power (Jn. 11: 49f.). This consultation of the Sanhedrin was caused by the failure of its representatives to successfully challenge Jesus' authority (11: 28-33), to discredit him with the people or the government (12: 13-17), and to entrap him in his interpretation of the Law (12: 18-27). It did not represent the first appearance of their murderous plan against him; for they had long since determined upon his death (Jn. 5: 18), but a conviction that their plan must be carried out,—the only question being as to how it might be accomplished without creating a riot among the people, with whom they knew he was intensely popular. In view of this, they agreed that nothing must be attempted **during the feast**, when publicity could not be avoided.

3. **While he was in Bethany . . . as he sat at meat:** The Fourth

the leper, as he sat at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster cruse of ointment of ¹ pure nard very costly; *and* she brake the cruse, and poured it

¹ *liquid.*

Evangelist definitely places this supper on the evening previous to the Triumphal Entry (12 : 1f., 12), and while the Synoptists unite in placing it here, no one of them does so with any distinct statement of time that necessarily connects it with the preceding context. It is likely that Mark either found it so generally connected with the story of Judas' treachery in the Apostolic preaching as to be left without hint of the other connection, or else, out of a tendency to group his material (see notes on 3 : 6) connected it himself with the account of Judas' compact with the Rulers, and in so doing was followed by Matthew, Luke omitting all mention of the meal, in view of a similar incident narrated by him in the record of the Galilean ministry (7 : 36-50). **In the house of Simon the leper:** The Fourth Gospel represents the house as Martha's (12 : 2), and does not introduce the name Simon into his account. Simon may have been the father of the family and separated from them by his disease, or cured from it and still known by the name of "leper," as Matthew was by the name of "publican" after he had become a disciple (Matt. 10 : 3), or he may have been no longer alive. The mention of his name in connection with the house does not necessitate his having been present as host. **A woman:** The Fourth Evangelist indicates the woman as Mary, the sister of Martha who served, and adds that Lazarus was one of the guests (cf. 12 : 2f. with 11 : 2). **An alabaster cruse** (lit. *an alabaster*, a box or flask, usually, though not necessarily, made of that substance—so named from Alabastron in Egypt, where the stone was found and where a local manufacture of perfume vases was carried on, Ptolemæus, IV, 5, § 39. The material was supposed to preserve the aroma of the perfumes) **of ointment:** John substitutes the weight of the ointment ("a pound") for the flask that contained it (12 : 3). **Pure** (lit. *trustworthy*) **nard** (so only Mark and John, 12 : 3. Matthew does not name the ointment, 26 : 7): Nard (rendered "spikenard" in A. V., from the spiked or shaggy leaves from which the perfume is secured) is a product of the *Nardostachys Jatamansi*, a species of *Valerian* native to the Himalayan region of Northern and Eastern India (Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*, p. 485). It was used by wealthy Hebrews (Song 1 : 12; 4 : 13f.), later by Greeks and Romans. Because it was very costly, it was often adulterated. Here it was used pure. **She broke the cruse** (so only in Mark)—the long neck of the flask, so that the ointment might be more readily poured out and

4. over his head. But there were some that had indignation among themselves, *saying*, To what purpose hath this waste of the ointment been made? For this ointment might have been sold for above three hundred shillings, and given to the poor. And they murmured against her. But Jesus said,
6. Let her alone; why trouble ye her? she hath wrought a good work on me. For ye have the poor always with you, and whensoever ye will ye can do them good: but me ye have not always.
8. She hath done what she could; she hath anointed my body beforehand for the burying. And verily I say unto you, Wheresoever the gospel shall be

all of it used, rather than drop by drop through its narrow mouth and most of it retained for other uses. **Poured it over his head** (John says, "the feet," 12 : 3; cf. also 11 : 2, his memory being confused perhaps by his reminiscence of Luke's story of the sinful woman, 7 : 38): The anointing of the head with oil was a customary mark of attention to a guest (Ps. 23 : 5; Lk. 7 : 46).

4, 5. **Some** (Matthew says "the disciples," 26 : 8; John, "Judas Iscariot," 12 : 3) . . . **had indignation** (lit. *were indignant to themselves*, i.e. *expressed their indignation among themselves*, cf. 16 : 3): The disciples, being accustomed only to simple living, would be quite likely to be the ones sensitive to the obvious extravagance; Judas, being distinctively mercenary, might well be the one who voiced the protest. **Three hundred shillings** (lit. *denarii*)—about \$51 in nominal value. **Given to the poor**: From 6 : 37, we may infer that the cost of the ointment would have fed many thousands of the hungry poor. This fact may have been called to their mind significantly at the Passover time, when such alms were specially expected (cf. Jn. 13 : 29). **Murmured against her**—not for her attention to the Master in itself, but in its wastefulness, as ordinary oil would have served all the purpose of respect, and in its incongruity, as the Master's spirit was known to be one of benevolence to the poor (cf. 10 : 21).

6-9. The Master's rebuke of the protest was a commendation of the act. From a utilitarian point of view, it was not in accord with his teachings; but as the expression of a deep-seated love, it was a goodly

preached throughout the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her.

act. For this act, conscious of what lay before him of the hatred of the human heart, he was profoundly grateful, and knowing not only what he had done for Mary in the restoration of her brother to life (Jn. 11 : 43f.), but what he had become to her in his teaching (Lk. 10 : 39-42), he accepted it as a rightful tribute to himself. **The poor** they had **always** with them, and they could serve them **whenever** they would, but himself they would **not** have **always**. If they realized that, as he did, they would not have objected to this spontaneous outpouring of Mary's love, but would have been stimulated by it to an expression of such love as they themselves possessed. What **she** had **done** was **what she could** do (only in Mark). It was measured up to her means and station in life. Instead of criticising, they might well have given a proportioned expression to their love for him. She doubtless had no premonition of his coming death; his disciples, in view of his repeated announcements to them of his passion, should have had some. To make their protest, therefore, all the less excusable, he interprets her act as an anticipated anointing of his dead body—not its embalming, which was not a Hebrew but an Egyptian custom (Gen. 50 : 2f., 26), but its anointing with spices and oils after it had been washed (cf. 16 : 1; Acts 9 : 37; Jn. 19 : 39f.), with a view to its preparation **for the burying**. John modifies the Master's words, though he retains the idea, 12 : 7. **Whosoever this Gospel shall be preached:** What is announced later in 13 : 10 is here assumed (Swete, *ad. loc.*). **Shall be spoken of:** He does not make this an organic part of his Gospel, but intimates that when his followers come to tell the story of his mission and message to the world, they will have so appreciated Mary's act that they will ever recall it for the generous expression of the personal love and devotion it actually was. This is omitted by the Fourth Evangelist. **Judas Iscariot** (cf. notes on 3 : 19) . . . **went away unto the chief priests**—not necessarily immediately after the supper, as Matthew seems to imply, 26 : 14, but as incited by the supper's episode to arrange with the Rulers for the Master's apprehension. Just how he was moved to this act by what had taken place it may be impossible definitely to say. Perhaps the Master's significant statement as to his burial may have led Judas to the desperate idea that only by Jesus' arrest would he be forced to declare his Messianic Kingship and so bring to realization the material kingdom which he selfishly hoped the Master would establish, or his resentment at the wasteful use of money, which otherwise might have come into his hands, and his

10. And Judas Iscariot, ¹ he that was one of the twelve, went away unto the chief priests, that he might deliver him unto them. And they, when they heard it, were glad, and promised to give him money. And he sought how he might conveniently deliver him *unto them*.
12. And on the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover, his disciples say unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and make ready that

¹ Grk. *the one of the twelve*.

suspicion that the Master had already discovered his thieving habits (cf. Jn. 12 : 6) may have driven him to sever once for all his connection with the Cause and give himself over to the things which would better minister to his greed. Probably the incident had wrought upon him in all directions. **And they . . . were glad:** His conference with the Priests could hardly have occurred before the consultation of the Sanhedrists among themselves, referred to in ver. 1f.; otherwise there would have been some evidence of his connection with the scheme. On the other hand, his conference with the Priests did not necessarily result in a plan to take Jesus during the feast, much less in an agreement on Judas' part to their purpose to kill him. It simply made Judas an instrument in the carrying out of their general design to get Jesus into their power—they promising to **give him money** and he seeking **how he might conveniently** (*i.e.* without creating a disturbance. Luke says distinctly "in the absence of the multitude," 22 : 6) **deliver him** into their hands. That the betrayal finally took place during the feast was doubtless as much unexpected by Judas as by the Rulers, being made unavoidable by the Master's disclosure of his knowledge of the plot (Jn. 13-26f.). Matthew alone mentions the amount of money which he received by the compact—"thirty pieces of silver" (26 : 15; cf. Zech. 11 : 12), in value about two-fifths of what the spikenard had cost, though this may have been merely earnest money—Mark's mention of the promise of money apparently referring to a sum yet to come.

(2) *The Last Supper, 14 : 12-25*

12. **The first day** (Luke simply, "the day," 22 : 7) **of unleavened bread:** This was Thursday of Holy Week, the 14th Nisan of the Jewish calendar, which extended from the evening of the 13th to the evening of the 14th, when the 15th began and the Paschal Meal was eaten (Ex. 12 : 8). It was really the day of preparation for the

13. thou mayest eat the passover? And he sendeth two of his disciples, and saith unto them, Go into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher
14. of water: follow him; and wheresoever he shall enter in, say to the master of the house, The Teacher saith, Where is my guest-chamber, where I shall eat the
15. passover with my disciples? And he will himself show you a large upper room furnished *and* ready: and
16. there make ready for us. And the disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover.

feast when (on the evening of the 13th) the homes were searched for the removal of all leaven and before noon (on the 14th) unleavened bread began to be eaten. It was also the day **when they sacrificed the passover**, *i.e.* the passover lamb (see margin of Ex. 12 : 6). This was usually done by the head of the family with sacrificial ceremony in the court of the Priests, on occasions, by the Priests themselves (Edersheim, *Temple*, p. 190ff.). **Where wilt thou that we . . . make ready that thou mayest eat the passover?** The meal had to be eaten within the city and the Master was still in retirement outside (ver. 13). Luke represents Jesus as taking the initiative, though the disciples ask him as to the specific place (22 : 8f.). Beyond the providing of the place, the preparation for the meal itself was considerable.

13-16. **Two of the disciples:** Matthew makes no mention of the number, 26 : 18; Luke, on the other hand, gives their names, "Peter and John," 22 : 8. **There shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water** (so only Mark and Luke, 22 : 10; Matthew makes no mention of the man, 26 : 18): As in the preparations for the Triumphal Entry, the details are presented in a way to leave the impression of foreknowledge on the Master's part, at least with regard to their being met by the man (see notes on 11 : 3). As water carrying was usually the task of women, the detection of this servant of the house (cf. Deut. 29 : 11) would be a relatively simple matter for the disciples. The water was doubtless for the ablutions of the sacred meal and had been drawn from the Pool of Siloam. They were to **follow him** through the streets until they came to the house where the Master may have already arranged for the eating of the meal. They were then to inquire for the accommodations of **the master of the house** in the name of the **Teacher**—making it more than probable

17. And when it was evening he cometh with the twelve.
 18. And as they sat and were eating, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you shall betray me, *even*

that their host was himself a disciple, as may possibly have been the case with the owners of the colt (cf. 11 : 3-6). The master of the house would then **show** them a **large upper room furnished and ready**, *i.e.* provided with the necessary table and reclining couches and spread with the needed table ware. There they were to **make ready** the meal. These instructions they carried out. Mark and Luke (22 : 10-13) alone give these details. Matthew contents himself with the general direction and its accomplishment (26 : 18f.). The Fourth Gospel has no account at all of the preparation.

The difference between the Passion chronology of the Synoptics and that of the Fourth Gospel cannot be reconciled. As stated above (notes on ver. 12) the Synoptists place the Last Supper on the evening which ushered in the 15th Nisan—the evening following the Day of Preparation; on the other hand, the Fourth Gospel states that the meal was eaten on the evening which ushered in the 14th Nisan—the evening beginning the Day of Preparation (13 : 1; 18 : 28; 19 : 14). According to the Fourth Gospel's view, therefore, the meal which was eaten was not the Paschal Meal, but a private meal eaten with the disciples—the Paschal Meal still remaining to be eaten after the trial and the crucifixion (18 : 28; 19 : 14, 31).

As between these two chronologies that of the Fourth Gospel would seem to be the more consistent; for if the Last Supper was identical with the Paschal Meal, as intimated by the Synoptists, it is difficult to account for the secular activities which followed—the arrest by an armed band from the Temple, the gathering of the Sanhedrists for the trial, the prosecution of the case before Pilate, and the crowding of the Priests out to the place of crucifixion. It is possible, of course, that the urgency of the case may have forced the Sanhedrists to the profanation of the day; but it is not likely, and there is no hint given in the Synoptics that the day was being profaned. In fact, Luke's statement would seem to indicate that the day of the Paschal Meal was still to come; for he records Jesus as saying that while it was his desire to eat the Passover with his disciples before he suffered, he would nevertheless not eat of it "until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God" (22 : 14-16). For an argument in favor of the agreement of the two accounts see Smith, *In the Days of His Flesh*, Appendix VIII, pp. 533-539.

17-21. **And when it was evening** (of the 14th, *i.e.* the beginning of the 15th Nisan. The Fourth Gospel states that the meal was eaten on the evening of the 13th Nisan, *i.e.* on the beginning of the

19. he that eateth with me. They began to be sorrowful,
 20. and to say unto him one by one, Is it I? And he
 said unto them, *It is one of the twelve, he that dippeth*

14th, Jn. 13 : 1; 18 : 28; 19 : 14) the Master **cometh with the twelve** into the city to the place where the preparation had been made. **And as they sat** (lit. *reclined*) **and were eating**: Luke inserts here remarks with which the Master introduced the meal and indicated to the disciples the peculiar significance it had for him in view of his impending passion and follows it (inaccurately) with an account of the drinking of a cup before the breaking of the bread (22 : 15-18); John recites the Master's washing of the disciples' feet, with his interpreting remarks (13 : 1-20). Matthew follows Mark in omitting these items and recounting as the first incident of the meal the Master's reference to his coming betrayal (26 : 21-24). **One of you shall betray me**, Mark adding **he that eateth with me** (which Luke recasts in a more rhetorical statement, 22 : 21): This does not single out the individual, being intended to call attention to the treachery, rather than to the traitor. **They began to be sorrowful**: (Matthew puts it more strongly, "exceedingly sorrowful," 26 : 22. Neither Luke nor John refer to the sorrow): The indefiniteness with which the Master had, on previous occasions, referred to the fact of his coming betrayal (cf. Matt. 17 : 22; 20 : 18; 26 : 2; Jn. 6 : 71) had given the disciples no intimation of the fact that it was to be accomplished by one of their own number. The shock of the Master's statement, therefore, can be easily understood. It was unbelievable! John speaks of the "doubt" with which they looked at each other, as though they sought some confirmation of the statement in the faces at the table (13 : 22). Luke states what must have followed: "They began to question among themselves which of them it was that should do this thing" (22 : 23). Mark and Matthew (26 : 22) mention only the individual inquiring of the Master into which their startled fear at last broke forth, Is it I (lit. *It is not I, is it*)? It was a general and confused questioning which allowed no individual answers—the only definite reply being the answer which he gave to the inquiry suggested by Peter through John, as to the traitor's identity (13 : 23-25). This answer, however, seems to have been given to the Beloved Disciple privately and not communicated by him to the rest; since they seemed to be still unaware of the traitor's identity when Judas left the room (vs. 27-29). To the company in general the Master answered merely, **one of the twelve, he that dippeth with me in the dish**—the dish of sauce—the *Charoseth*—into which at a certain time of the meal the master of the feast dipped pieces of the unleavened bread with bitter herbs between them, and handed them to the guests

21. with me in the dish. For the Son of man goeth, even as it is written of him: but woe unto that man through whom the Son of man is betrayed! good were it ¹ for that man if he had not been born.
22. And as they were eating, he took ² bread, and when he had blessed, he brake it, and gave to them, and

¹ Grk. *for him if that man had not.*² a loaf.

(J. Lightfoot, *Matthew, ad. loc.*). This general statement of the Master's, while emphasizing more forcibly the betrayal of the common fellowship (cf. Ps. 41 : 9) they had with him, obviously did not yet identify the traitor and, with the following solemn words of woe, apparently left the disciples in a benumbed state of mind, which did not press for further information. Matthew, while following Mark, adds the most unlikely fact that Judas asked definitely whether he himself was meant, and that the Master answered "Thou hast said" (26 : 25). The Fourth Gospel states definitely and in accordance with the ritual of the meal, that Jesus, in reply to John's question, said, "It is he for whom I shall dip the sop and give it to him. So when he had dipped the sop, he taketh and giveth it to Judas" (13 : 26). Luke makes no reference to the dish or to the indication of the traitor. **For the Son of man goeth** (properly, *goeth away*, i.e. out of the world) **even as it is written of him** (Luke, "as it hath been determined," 22 : 22): This confirms the announcement of the betrayal by the statement that the death which was dependent upon it was a fulfilment of the prophetic forecast of Scripture (Isa. 53d ch.). The betrayal, thus, was not a happening of chance, but essentially a part of the predicted and predetermined Passion of the Son of Man, and yet, **Woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed!** for that betrayal was the free act of a moral agent and must bring upon itself, in perfect justice, its awful punishment (cf. Lk. 22 : 3; Jn. 13 : 2). This "woe," therefore, is not a vindictive curse, but a sorrowful proclamation of the inevitable judgment. (See Hogg, *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*, pp. 195-198). **Good were it for that man if he had never been born**—more severe than the somewhat similar expression of 9 : 42. Luke follows this incident with an account of a contention among the disciples as to which of them was accounted greatest (22 : 24-30), a most unlikely dispute to follow such a solemn experience as they had just had, and, therefore, more likely a recital of what occurred as the occasion of the feet-washing before the feast, as recorded by the Fourth Gospel (13 : 4).

22-25. The giving of the sop was followed by the departure of

23. said, Take ye: this is my body. And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them: and
24. they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the ¹ covenant, which is poured out for

¹ Some MSS. insert *new*.

Judas (Jn. 13 : 30), the significance of which, in spite of the Master's words (Jn. 13 : 27), seems to have been hidden from the rest of the disciples (Jn. 13 : 28f.). After the interruption occasioned by the announcement of the betrayal, the meal proceeded. It is impossible, however, to say definitely at just which one of its remaining stages the usual form of observance was departed from by the Master, in order to use the materials of the meal to show the spiritual significance of his death. **He took bread**—one of the round cakes of unleavened bread, placed before the one who presided over the feast. **And when he had blessed** (Luke, "had given thanks," 22 : 19; so also Paul, 1 Cor. 11 : 24)—doubtless one of the formal blessings used in connection with the meal, and, therefore, different from that employed at the feeding of the multitude (see notes on 6 : 41). **He brake it and gave to them**—for their own use and not, as at the miraculous feeding, for the use of others (6 : 41). **Take ye** (Matthew inaccurately adds, "eat," 26 : 26; Luke omits both commands, 22 : 19), **this is my body** (Luke, who is here not primary, omits "take" and adds "which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me," 22 : 19, cf. 1 Cor. 11 : 24). This, of course, cannot have been intended by the Master to be understood literally; since, as he spoke, his body stood before them separate and distinct from the bread. It was meant to be taken figuratively, as his statement regarding the cup (Lk. 22 : 20). The bread represented, symbolized, his body. As this bread was given to them, so, in this impending final conflict between his spiritual mission and the materialism of the Jews, his body was to be given, willingly, freely, to establish for them—and for all people—his kingdom of spiritual righteousness in the world. More than this he does not say; but if they remembered his discourse in the Capernaum Synagogue, they as Orientals would understand that as by eating this bread they secured its physical benefits, so by personal fellowship and communion with him would they be spiritually feeding upon his body and partaking of the blessings which its giving up in death was to secure for them (cf. Jn. 6 : 51, 53-58). **And he took a cup**: As it is impossible definitely to state at what stage in the meal this symbolizing of the materials took place (see above, ver. 22), so it is impossible to identify this cup among the four which were drunk at the meal—except that it was not the first cup, which came

25. many. Verily I say unto you, I shall no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

as the guests reclined themselves at the table. Possibly, in view of the declaration of ver. 25, it may have been the fourth, or last cup, which closed the Meal (cf. Lk. 22 : 20; 1 Cor. 11 : 25, where it is stated that the cup was taken "after supper," though Luke here, as in 19b, is not primary). **And when he had given thanks**—as he had done in connection with the bread. The difference in the terms does not indicate any essential difference in the acts—as though in the one case he had invoked a blessing upon the bread and in the other, had given thanks for the wine—since invocations at Jewish meals, as a general thing, mingled thanksgiving with blessing. **And they all drank of it:** Matthew, in the spirit of a later confessionalism, turns this into a command of the Master's, "Drink ye all of it," (26 : 27). **This is my blood of the Covenant, which is poured out for many** (Matthew adds a statement of the purpose of this out-pouring, expressed in the phrase with which the early Apostolic preaching proclaimed the object and the outcome of repentance and baptism [cf. Acts 2 : 38; 22 : 16] and the result of faith [cf. Acts 10 : 43; 13 : 38. See notes on 1 : 4]: Luke phrases it "the new covenant in my blood [following Paul, cf. 1 Cor. 11 : 25], even that which is poured out for you," 22 : 20). The thought of the Master was suggested naturally by the words of Ex. 24 : 8, where the ancient covenant of God with Israel was sealed with the blood of the sacrifice, and his meaning was that in the offering up of his life in this conflict of his spiritual mission with the materialism of the Nation there would be established a spiritual covenant with his followers in which would be confirmed and assured all that his mission had come to accomplish in the world (cf. Jer. 31 : 31-33). **I shall no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God** (Luke, inaccurately, connects these words with the partaking of the initial cup and the first bread of the meal, 22 : 14-18)—not merely a renewed announcement of the nearness of this sacrifice of himself, but an assertion of the ultimate triumph of the spiritual kingdom he was giving his life to establish. While it is evident that Jesus added no direction as to the continued observance of this meal by his followers, it is just as clear that the significance which he placed upon its symbolism of this coming supreme self-sacrificing act of his mission would make it as impossible for his followers not to keep it in mind by a recurrent observance of it, as the Master himself declared it would be impossible for him to forget it till the consummation of his kingdom brought himself and his followers together in the

26. And when they had sung a hymn, they went out unto the mount of Olives.

marriage supper of the Lamb. It does no violence, therefore, to the simple narrative which the Gospel gives, to find implied in this impressive modification of what the Synoptists consider the Passover meal—the final effort to bring to the utmost of the disciples' understanding the eternally spiritual meaning of the death to which he was now going—that intention of its after observance which is given us in Paul's recital of the event to the Corinthian Church, "This do in remembrance of me" (1 Cor. 11 : 24f.). The Fourth Gospel gives no account of this specific phase of the meal which has become the Lord's Supper of the Christian Church. The remarks of the Master leading up to the pointing out of the traitor and his withdrawal from the room (13 : 12-30) are followed by the valedictory discourses, which, when they are recovered from their present displaced condition, arrange themselves most probably as follows: 13 : 31a, chs. 15, 16; 14 : 13 : 31b-38; ch. 17. At the passage 13 : 31b-38 the Johannine record is paralleled again by the Synoptic record of Mk. 14 : 27-31; Matt. 26 : 31-35 and Lk. 22 : 31-38.

(3) *The Departure to the Mount of Olives, with the Foretelling of the Desertion and the Denial, 14 : 26-31*

26. **And when they had sung a hymn**—in all likelihood, the remaining portion of the *Hallel* (Ps. 115-118), which finally ended the Paschal meal. **They went out unto the Mount of Olives**—where they had spent their nights during the week (cf. Lk. 22 : 39); so that Peter's question, as given in the Fourth Gospel (13 : 36), "Lord, whither goest thou?" does not refer to the closing words of Ch. 14, "Arise, let us go hence"; for this would be understood as a summons to leave for their place of customary rest. The reference is to the vague declaration (13 : 33), "Ye shall seek me: and as I said unto the Jews, whither I go, ye cannot come." It is this query of Peter's and his resentful reply to the Master's answer to it (13 : 36f.) which most probably brought from Jesus his announcement of the disciples' general desertion and of Peter's personal denial of him which were to take place that night. Matthew follows Mark in representing the departure as taking place before the disclosure of the desertion of the disciples (26 : 30). Luke (22 : 39) and John (14 : 31) place it after. The rearrangement of the Fourth Gospel material would seem to suggest that along with the Valedictory Prayer, it came after the summons to leave, but before the actual departure. (See closing paragraph in notes on ver. 25.)

27. And Jesus saith unto them, All ye shall be offended:
 for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the
 28. sheep shall be scattered abroad. Howbeit, after I
 29. am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee. But
 Peter said unto him, Although all shall be offended,

27-31. **All ye shall be offended** (lit. *caused to stumble, find cause for stumbling*, as Lk. 7 : 23; Matthew adds "in me this night," 26 : 31): After the disclosure to them at the Supper that one of their number was to betray the Master (ver. 18)—a possibility which each one seemed to disclaim with more or less of a dread as to what his own weakness might lead him to do (ver. 19)—this announcement that they would all, without exception, fall away and desert him, presumably in his hour of need, must have been overwhelmingly startling to them, and yet it was a situation which the Master might easily forecast, from his intimate knowledge of the disciples and from the disclosures they had made of themselves that night. **For it is written I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered abroad**—taken freely from Zech. 13 : 7, where Jehovah calls upon the sword to smite a ruler, who is abusing his place and position as Jehovah's friend, and thus scatter his sheep abroad. The pertinency in the quoting of the passage here lies in the common effect upon the sheep of the punishment of the shepherd. By this citing of Scripture the Master will assure to the disciples the prediction he has just made (cf. ver. 21). **After I am raised up**—which was to be but a brief time (see notes on 8 : 31)—**I will go before you into Galilee**: The absence of this comforting promise and any fulfilment of it from the narrative of Luke—whose whole post-Resurrection record is confined to Jerusalem, as Matthew's and Mark's are restricted to Galilee—is evidence merely of two different but not necessarily conflicting traditions. On the other hand, the fact that while Mark confirms this promise in 16 : 7 (Matt. 28 : 7, 10), there is no record of its fulfilment in the remainder of the chapter (as there is in Matt. 28 : 16-19), is strong corroborative proof that the latter portion of this 16th chapter is not its original ending. **But Peter said . . . Although all shall be offended, yet will not I**: This protest of Peter's doubtless voiced the feelings of the rest of the Twelve, as later (ver. 31) his vehement assertion that he would not deny his Master was repeated by them all. **Thou to-day, even this night, before the cock crow twice, shalt deny me thrice**: Jesus' reply is significant in its definiteness of statement, as though he would once and for all destroy the self-assurance with which Peter asserted his fidelity. The Apostle's self-confidence, however, based as it was on a failure to

30. yet will not I. And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, that thou to-day, *even* this night, before
31. the cock crow twice, shalt deny me thrice. But he spake exceeding vehemently, If I must die with thee, I will not deny thee. And in like manner also said they all.
32. And they come unto a place which was named Gethsemane: and he saith unto his disciples, Sit ye

realize the impending events, was simply strengthened by these words; for he answered **exceeding vehemently** (lit. *greatly beyond measure*. So only Mark), **If I must die with thee** (see Jn. 11 : 16), **I will not deny thee**. And in like manner also said they all. Doubtless, they had been startled by the Master's prediction of their general defection (ver. 27), but however his words may have increased such individual dread as each one may have had as to his own weakness, there was no question in their hearts as to the loyalty they desired to show. Consequently, when the Master met Peter's protest with this further and more definite forecast of his specific denial of him, the impossibility in their minds of such an event expressed itself in the same passionate way as with Peter himself. The definiteness of the Master's forecast does not necessarily involve a supernatural foreknowledge of the specific details of Peter's action. "Before the cock crow" means simply before dawn, the "twice" which Mark alone has being evidently read back into the statement from Peter's keen memory of the actual occurrence (ver. 72); while the "shalt deny me thrice" is rather to warn the Apostle of the aggravated character of the disloyalty he is to show than to predict the number of times it is to be expressed. Luke has largely modified the record of this incident, prefacing this definite statement of the Master's with a warning to the Apostle which betrays later elements and which is followed by a protest from the Apostle in language similar to his final assertion, which the Evangelist omits (22 : 31-33). This definite prediction of Peter's denial is also followed by a general warning to the Twelve (22 : 35-38) whose wording seems to refer to the instructions previously given to the Seventy (10 : 4).

(4) *The Agony in Gethsemane, 14 : 32-42*

32. They come unto a place (lit. *a piece of ground, a field*) . . . named Gethsemane (probable meaning, *oil press*): As the name indicates, this was in all likelihood an enclosure which had been originally an olive orchard, containing an oil press, but had been

33. here, while I pray. And he taketh with him Peter and ¹ James and John, and began to be greatly amazed,
 34. and sore troubled. And he saith unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death: abide ye here,
 35. and watch. And he went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed that, if it were possible,
 36. the hour might pass away from him. And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; remove this cup from me: howbeit not what I will, but
 37. what thou wilt. And he cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith unto Peter, Simon, sleepest thou?
 38. couldst thou not watch one hour? ² Watch and pray,

¹ *Jacob.*² *Watch ye, and pray that ye enter not.*

transformed into a private garden (cf. Jn. 18 : 1), several of which apparently existed outside the city walls (cf. Jn. 19 : 41). The Fourth Gospel locates it apparently just across the Kidron (18 : 1), in which case its site would be most probably the traditional one, some fifty yards beyond the Brook, and, as Jesus had been accustomed to go there often with his disciples (Jn. 18 : 2), Judas and his company would naturally search it on their way to his settled resting place for the night, on the Mount of Olives (Jn. 18 : 2f.). Luke, however, who does not mention its name, apparently identifies it with this resting place itself (22 : 39f.; see notes on 11 : 12). In either case, the place would be well known to the Betrayer. **Sit ye here, while I pray:** The disciples are bidden to remain near the entrance, while the Master goes farther into the enclosure to engage in prayer by himself cf. 1 : 35; 6 : 46; see notes on 9 : 2.

33-42. **Peter, James and John:** While his instinct was to be alone in his communion with his Father, the growing fellowship of these three with himself impelled him to take them nearer the scene of his struggle, as before he had taken them to the scene of his transfiguration (cf. Lk. 9 : 28). **Greatly amazed** (so alone Mark): Though the Master had foreseen the outcome of his mission as a fact, yet as he drew near its realization he was overwhelmed with its significance as the answer of sin to the love of God. In this consciousness of its spiritual meaning was naturally involved the consternation of his human soul as it faced the death which was involved in this answer. As a consequence, he was **sore troubled . . . even unto death**

that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed
 39. is willing, but the flesh is weak. And again he went
 40. away, and prayed, saying the same words. And again
 he came, and found them sleeping, for their eyes were
 very heavy; and they knew not what to answer him.
 41. And he cometh the third time, and saith unto them,
¹ Sleep on now, and take your rest: it is enough; the
 hour is come; behold, the Son of man is betrayed into
 42. the hands of sinners. Arise, let us be going: behold,
 he that betrayeth me is at hand.

¹ *Do ye sleep on, then, and take your rest?*

(i.e. his suffering was killing him). So he admits to the three disciples as he bids them wait and **watch**—not as guarding against an attack, but as affording him the support of their presence—as Matthew's phrase, "watch with me," intimates (26 : 38, 40). **If it were possible, the hour** (Mark, alone, whose interpretation it apparently is of the figurative expression "cup" used in the prayer, by Matthew, 26 : 39, and by Luke, 22 : 42)—**might pass away from him**: This petition that, if possible, his work might be accomplished without the coming to him of this appointed experience is, as the amazement and deadly sorrow of his soul indicate, not alone a plea to be spared the physical pain of death, but much more the awful consciousness which it would bring with it of the reality of the sin of the world. But this plea was an expression of the horror of his soul, as it viewed the coming Passion, not the disclosure of an unwillingness to undergo it. The Father's will in the appointment of the experience was supreme, even as the petition was uttered. **Saith unto Peter**—whose boastful protestation of loyalty to his Master made him the natural object of the sorrowful rebuke, though all were asleep. Luke, whose record differs greatly from the others and betrays some elements of later tradition (e.g. vs. 43, 44), says that their sleeping came from "sorrow" (22 : 45). **Watch and pray**: To the former charge to watch with him he now adds the warning to pray for themselves; for it has become now a matter of concern whether the willingness of their hearts to be faithful to him would withstand the human fear and dread which the impending attack upon him would arouse within them. They are to pray, as he had already done particularly for Peter (Lk. 22 : 31f.), that they may be spared the hour of crisis; but if not, that they may be firm in its test. **Again he . . . prayed**—for his victory

43. And straightway, while he yet spake, cometh Judas, one of the twelve, and with him a multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders. Now he that betrayed him had given them a token, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that is he; take him, and lead him away safely.

was not yet complete. When at last, after a third period of prayer, it was assured, he needed their watchful sympathy no longer. They had proved helpless to him in this struggle of his soul, they could sleep on now, if they so wished—the struggle which would seem to them more fearsome was at hand: **the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners**. But it is enough, the sadly justified reproach must give way to the summons to **arise and be going**—evidently back to the other disciples—for **he that betrayeth him was at hand**. Luke omits all the remainder of the incident after the warning to watch and pray.

(5) *The Arrest, 14 : 43-52*

43. **One of the twelve**—not to describe him, but to express anew the consciousness of the infamy of the deed. **A multitude**: According to the Synoptists, the arresting party was an unorganized crowd, armed only with the short **swords** carried by private persons (cf. ver. 47) and **staves**, or stout sticks. It was such a crowd as might hastily be gathered together in an attack upon a marauder (cf. ver. 48). It was evidently placed at Judas' disposal by the members of the Sanhedrin and apparently included some of the servants of the High Priest (cf. ver. 47), as well as representatives of the members of that high court (cf. Lk. 22 : 52). Luke adds to them the officers of the Levitical guard of the Temple (22 : 52; cf. Edersheim, *Temple*, p. 119) with whom he states Judas consulted when he made arrangements for the betrayal (22 : 4). The Fourth Gospel gives a much more military impression of the undertaking by stating that the Sanhedrists had "a band (properly, *a cohort*) of soldiers" with its "chief captain" (lit. *chiliarch*) and that these were armed with regular "weapons." He also names the High Priest's servant, "Malchus" (18 : 3, 10, 12).

44-47. **A token** (lit. *a concerted signal*)—since it was night and the indiscriminate character of the crowd gave no surety of their ability to distinguish Jesus in the confusion which was likely to arise. This is omitted by Luke. **Kiss**—not the affectionate family greeting on the cheek, but the ordinary greeting of a pupil to his

45. And when he was come, straightway he came to him,
 46. and saith, Rabbi; and ¹ kissed him. And they laid
 47. hands on him, and took him. But a certain one of
 them that stood by drew his sword, and smote the
² servant of the high priest, and struck off his ear.
 48. And Jesus answered and said unto them, Are ye
 come out, as against a robber, with swords and staves
 49. to seize me? I was daily with you in the temple
 teaching, and ye took me not: but *this is done* that the

¹ kissed him much.² Grk. bondservant.

teacher—the salutation, “Rabbi,” an obeisance, and a kiss on the hand (cf. ver. 45; Matt. 26 : 49). **Safely** (lit. *securely*): The idea of Judas was not to avoid violence, but to accomplish the certain carrying out of his plan which would naturally seem to him in danger of failure now that Jesus had shown his knowledge of it. Mark alone refers to this direction. Luke introduces a rebuking protest on Jesus’ part as the kiss was given, and an appeal to the Master on the part of the disciples to defend him, as Judas’ purpose disclosed itself (22 : 48f.). Matthew represents the Master as addressing Judas on his approach with a remark, the meaning of which in the original text is not plain (26 : 50). **Drew his sword and smote the servant of the high priest**: Though the appeal for permission to defend the Master (Lk. 22 : 49) was doubtless refused, the actual laying hold of him evidently aroused to action at least one of the disciples—definitely named in the Fourth Gospel as Peter (18 : 10). Matthew at some length (26 : 52–54) and Luke briefly (22 : 51) state that this impulsive deed was rebuked by Jesus, Luke adding that he healed the wound. John, who does not mention the kiss, gives a detailed statement representing the confusion of the crowd preceding the actual arrest, intimating apparently that it arose from their being overawed in some way by his presence (18 : 4–9). He also records the attempted defence and the rebuke (18 : 11).

48, 49. The Synoptists unite in stating that the arrest was followed by a protest on the part of Jesus, in which he places before the crowd the evil motive which must have lain behind the secrecy and armed force of their deed (cf. Matt. 26 : 55f.; Lk. 22 : 52f.). **That the Scriptures might be fulfilled**—referring rather to the spirit of such a passage as Isa. 53, than to any specific prediction of this incident. Luke omits these words, but gives the thought which they contain (22 : 53b).

50. scriptures might be fulfilled. And they all left him, and fled.
51. And a certain young man followed with him, having a linen cloth cast about him, over *his* naked *body*:
52. and they lay hold on him; but he left the linen cloth, and fled naked.
53. And they led Jesus away to the high priest: and there come together with him all the chief priests and

50. **They all left him and fled**—disclosing the purely impulsive character of their attempted defence of the Master and his clear insight into the instability of their protested loyalty to him (cf. vs. 27-31).

51, 52. This incident is peculiar to Mark. It contains nothing to disclose the identity of the **young man**, beyond the fact that he was not one of the Twelve. That his attire consisted in a **linen cloth, cast . . . over his naked body** shows that he had come hastily to the scene, perhaps from the house where the Meal had been eaten. If this was the house of Mary, the mother of Mark (cf. Acts 12 : 12), this stranger may have been the Evangelist himself (cf. Zahn, *N. T. Introd.*, p. 491f.).

(6) *The Trial before the Sanhedrin, 14 : 53-72*

53. **They led Jesus away to the high priest**: The Synoptists agree in recording that Jesus was brought directly to the high priest, whose name, Caiaphas, is however given alone by Matthew (26 : 57). There, according to Matthew (26 : 59-66) and Mark (vs. 55-64), he was placed on trial before the whole Council, which Matthew intimates was already gathered together in anticipation of the arrest (26 : 57), but is described by Mark as assembling upon the arrival of Jesus (ver. 54). Luke knows nothing of an immediate trial, but states that the Council was assembled, apparently in their usual place of gathering in the Temple, "as soon as it was day" (22 : 66); while John records a preliminary examination of the Prisoner by Annas, whom apparently he designates as "high priest" (18 : 19; cf. Acts 4 : 6) and whom he describes as "father in law to Caiaphas which was high priest that year" (18 : 13). After the examination was over, Annas sent him to Caiaphas (18 : 24). Of a trial before Caiaphas, or before the Sanhedrin in his presence, this Evangelist apparently gives no record. As Mark states, however (15 : 1), that the Prisoner was taken away to Pilate as soon as it was dawn, all we can infer from these fragmentary records is that the trial consisted in a

54. the elders and the scribes. And Peter had followed him afar off, even within, into the court of the high priest; and he was sitting with the officers, and warming himself in the light of the fire. Now the chief priests and the whole council sought witness against Jesus to put him to death; and found it not. For many bare false witness against him, and their witness agreed not together. And there stood up certain, and bare false witness against him, saying, We heard him say, I will destroy this ¹ temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made

¹ sanctuary.

preliminary examination by Annas, following which the trial before the Sanhedrists took place, which was closed by a personal examination of the Prisoner by Caiaphas. **All the chief priests**—the ex-high priests, as Annas, and possibly those who belonged to high-priestly families (cf. Acts 4 : 6; and see Schürer, *Jewish People*, II, i, 195-206). These, together with **the elders and the scribes**, constituted a full though informal meeting of the Sanhedrin (Edersheim, *Jesus*, II, p. 557f.).

54. **Peter had followed him . . . into the court of the high priest**—the open space (*atrium*) around which were built the chambers of the palace, in one of the upper rooms of which apparently (cf. ver. 66) the Council was gathered. Entrance to the court was gained by the "forecourt" (ver. 68, *marg.*), a passageway opening out upon the street. According to the Fourth Gospel, Peter secured admission to the court, through the good services of "another disciple" [John] who "was known unto the high priest" (18 : 15f.), his purpose being, doubtless, as Matthew states it, "to see the end" (26 : 58). He seated himself with the **officers** (lit. *servants*—probably members of the Temple guard who had made the arrest, cf. Lk. 22 : 52)—around "the fire of charcoal" (Jn. 18 : 18, *marg.*) which they had kindled to warm themselves (Jn. 18 : 18, omitted by Matthew), for at the altitude of Jerusalem the nights, even in the Spring-time, were chilly, especially in the hours before sunrise.

55-64. **Sought witness**: This was not a formal process of the regular Council. It was an irregular gathering with a definite purpose. It was not to try a case brought before it on charges, but to secure charges on which to carry the case to the Roman governor; since, in

59. without hands. And not even so did their witness
 60. agree together. And the high priest stood up in the
 midst, and asked Jesus, saying, Answerest thou
 nothing? what is it which these witness against thee?
 61. But he held his peace, and answered nothing. Again
 the high priest asked him, and saith unto him, Art
 62. thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus
 said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at
 the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds
 63. of heaven. And the high priest rent his clothes, and
 64. saith, What further need have we of witnesses? Ye
 have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? And

order to put Jesus to death, some evidence must be found to show that he had mortally offended Jewish law. **And found it not**—*i.e.* did not find it of such a character as would meet the requirements of the Law (cf. Num. 35 : 30; Deut. 17 : 6; 19 : 15); for though many had been secured who **bore false witness**—gave garbled testimony—as to what he had said or done, they could not be made to agree in the testimony which they gave. Finally, there came two (so alone Matthew, 26 : 60) who stated that they had **heard him say** that he would **destroy this temple made with hands, and in three days build another made without hands** (cf. Jn. 2 : 19; see later use of this same charge, Acts 6 : 14). But even in this testimony the witnesses did not agree to an extent that enabled the Council to establish a charge which would make it possible for them to demand his death at the hands of the Governor. (So alone Mark; while Luke makes no reference at all to witnesses in the trial.) All their resources in this direction having thus failed, effort was made to compel the Prisoner to incriminate himself. Jesus had throughout the proceedings maintained a silence that was justified by the falseness of the testimony and by his consciousness, not only of the utter hopelessness of convincing these of his right to life, but of the holy dignity of the position in which he stood before the Nation as its Messiah. Caiaphas therefore, rising from his seat, demanded that the Prisoner himself untangle the confused charge of sacrilege which the last two witnesses had produced and confess to the guilt which they had been unable to prove, but which, because there were two who referred to it, seemed hopefully to lurk in the facts. But Jesus still **held his peace**. Laying aside, therefore, all these secondary charges by which they had thought to

65. they all condemned him to be ¹ worthy of death. And some began to spit on him, and to cover his face, and to buffet him, and to say unto him, Prophecy: and the officers received him with blows of their hands.

¹ *liable to.*

involve him with the people, as well as to arraign him against the Law, the high priest confronted Jesus with a question which summed up the whole issue between him and the hierarchy—whether the Messiah was to be the spiritual supplanter of an enthroned ceremonialism, or its representative religiously and politically before the world. **Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?** (a term found only here in the New Testament, and one which may well have been used by the high priest to avoid the Holy Name, in which case Matthew gives the term in its Christian phrasing, 26 : 63). On this question—just because it raised the vital issue—Jesus could not be silent. He had challenged these ceremonial claims at the beginning of his ministry (see notes on 2 : 7-10); he accepts this challenge of his own claims here at its close and answers, **I am**, and adds to this a statement which leaves no doubt that his claims involve a fulfilment in himself of the supreme prerogatives of Messianic authority and power (cf. Ps. 110; Dan. 7 : 13). Matthew represents this question as put to Jesus on oath (26 : 63). Luke's record of the question and its answer differs greatly from that of Matthew and Mark, and is evidently not primary (22 : 67-70). Jesus' calm acceptance of this issue and his added assertion of divine rights—an assertion which carried with it the judgment of God upon their position—naturally aroused within Caiaphas and the Council feelings of anger and horror. To them it was not only defiance but blasphemy. To this the high priest testified by the symbolic rending of **his clothes** (his undergarments, as prescribed by custom, to express great sorrow, Gen. 37 : 29, 34, or indignant protest, Num. 14 : 6), and to his question, **What think ye?** they answered, **He is worthy of death.** This question to the Council and their reply is not recorded by Luke.

65. **Some**—of the members of the Council, now that the Prisoner was by his own confession an outcast of the Law, gave vent to their venom by heaping upon him the grossest of indignities and insults. They **began to spit upon him** (Matthew, more specifically “in his face,” 26 : 67; cf. Num. 12 : 14; Deut. 25 : 9; Isa. 50 : 6) **and to cover his face** (Possibly, after the Roman custom of covering the head of condemned criminals. Luke says “blindfolded him,” 22 : 64), and then to **buffet him** (lit. *strike with the fist*) while they mockingly called upon him to **prophecy** who struck him (Matthew gives full

66. And as Peter was beneath in the court, there cometh
 67. one of the maids of the high priest; and seeing Peter
 warming himself, she looked upon him and saith,
 68. Thou also wast with the Nazarene, *even* Jesus. But
 he denied, saying, I neither know, nor understand
 what thou sayest: and he went out into the porch;
 69. ¹ and the cock crew. And the maid saw him, and be-
 gan again to say to them that stood by, This is *one* of

¹ Many MSS. omit *and the cock crew*.

expression to their derision in his "Prophecy unto us, thou Christ, who is he that struck thee?" 26:68). Seeing the treatment he received from the Council, the **officers** (members of the Temple guard, who still had him in charge, cf. Lk. 22:52) **received him**—doubtless as he was knocked against them by the Sanhedrists—with **blows of their hands** (lit. *with blows of rods*, as in Jn. 18:22; 19:3; cf. *margins*). Luke represents all this outrage as perpetuated by the guards; but he misplaces it before the trial took place (22:63–65).

So ended the hours of this night of horror and iniquity. But the part in it played by Peter is yet to be told. Peter's denials of his Master, prepared for in ver. 54, are now recorded in detail.

66–72. **Beneath in the court:** The Sanhedrists were assembled, apparently in one of the upper rooms of the palace, overlooking the court (cf. Lk. 22:61), though unlikely within hearing even of such vigorous protestations as Peter made. **One of the maids of the high priest**—a young female slave (cf. Gal. 4:22), one of the high priest's domestics, whose duty apparently was to attend at the street door of the palace (Jn. 18:16; cf. Acts 12:13). She seemed first to notice him as a stranger in the group around the fire and then looking at him more attentively—in a way, perhaps, her duties as portress had accustomed her to do—recognized him as one whom possibly she had seen in Jesus' disciple company during these days of the Feast (cf. Jn. 18:17). **I neither know nor understand what thou sayest** (or, more likely, in his startled confusion, as in the margin, "I neither know nor understand: thou, what sayest thou?"). His denials are likely to have developed from general to specific negations, as he was repeatedly confronted with the facts, so that such a confused answer as this is what might be expected at first. Matthew presents the development most clearly (26:70–74); Luke, the least so (22:57–60). **Went out into the porch** (marg. "forecourt." Matthew, lit., *towards the gate*, 26:71): He left the light of

70. them. But he again denied it. And after a little while again they that stood by said to Peter, Of a truth
 71. thou art *one* of them; for thou art a Galilæan. But he began to curse, and to swear, I know not this man
 72. of whom ye speak. And straightway the second time the cock crew. And Peter called to mind the word, how that Jesus said unto him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. ¹ And when he thought thereon, he wept.

¹ *And he began to weep.*

the fire and retreated into the passageway leading to the door opening on the street. **Began again to say:** Mark represents this as a repeated statement by the same maid, asserting **to them that stood by** the rightfulness of her first charge; Matthew makes it another maid (26 : 71); Luke, another person (22 : 58). In any case, Peter seems to have heard the renewed accusation and again denied it, Matthew adding "with an oath" (26 : 72). Finally, **after a little while** (Luke, "after the space of about one hour," 22 : 59) Peter having apparently returned to the fire and brazened out the situation by entering into conversation with the loungers, began to betray his Galilean accent. This, as far as we have any knowledge, was defective in its gutturals and tended to lisping, and consequently in this respect could hardly have disclosed itself in the answers which he is recorded by Mark as giving, but is quite likely to have needed more of a conversation to make itself apparent; though there is not to be forgotten the general provincialism of tone and manner which must have been present in all he said. (See reference to local differences in pronunciation within Palestine in Jg. 12 : 6.) On this clear evidence, the charge is forcefully renewed. **Of a truth, thou art one of them,** to which he replies with his stoutest protestation and with a loss of all self-control calls down curses on himself in a desperate effort to sustain his lie. Luke has no reference to the profanity (22 : 60); while John, evidently at this point adds to the conclusiveness of the charge the fact that a kinsman of the high priest's servant, whom Peter had wounded at the arrest, recognized him as one whom he had seen with Jesus in the garden (18 : 26). **Straightway**—doubtless, as Peter finished (Luke puts it, "Immediately, while he yet spake," 22 : 60), **the second time the cock crew:** The first time (ver. 68) he may not have noticed it; though all the other Evangelists record but one crowing, and at this time, while the best text of ver. 68 records none

15. And straightway in the morning the chief priests with the elders and scribes, and the whole council, held a consultation, and bound Jesus, and carried

here. In either case, Peter now for the first time recalls what Jesus had said of his forthcoming denials. If the look which the Master gave the Apostle, probably from the upper room in one of the intervals of the trial, or after it was over (recorded alone by Luke, 22 : 61), is part of the incident, the consciousness of his perfidy must have been miserably increased and under its pressure, **he wept** (Matthew, 26 : 75, and Luke, 22 : 62, "he went out [of the court] and wept bitterly").

(7) *The Trial Before Pilate, 15 : 1-20*

1. **Straightway in the morning**, *i.e.* at the first break of day, so that Jesus might be taken to the Governor before the streets were crowded. **Held a consultation**: It would seem that after the so-called trial the Council had adjourned, reassembling at early dawn to consult as to how they should formulate the charge to be brought before the Governor. The only accusation which they had been able to work up against the Prisoner was a strictly religious one, which a Roman official would be quite likely to ignore, and all that they had accomplished would come to nought. Luke seems to have confused this consultation with the Council trial (22 : 66-71). **Delivered him up to Pilate**: When Archelaus, because of his intolerably oppressive rule, was, on petition by the Jews, removed from his ethnarchy over Judæa, Samaria and Idumæa, his domain was placed in charge of a Procurator, who was independent in his administration save in cases of extreme necessity or difficulty, when the Legate of Syria assumed command (cf. Schürer, I, ii, p. 44f.). He had thus in the normal conduct of his rule the right of deciding matters of life and death (cf. Schürer, I, ii, p. 57f.; Jn. 18 : 31). His official residence was at Cæsarea (cf. Acts 23 : 23), where he was assisted by a Council (cf. Schürer, I, ii, p. 60; Acts 25 : 12); but during the Passover week it was his custom to be present at Jerusalem with a detachment of soldiers to guard against possible outbreaks of Jewish fanaticism (cf. Schürer, I, ii, p. 48f.; Matt. 27 : 27). It is uncertain where he resided while in Jerusalem—whether in the palace (*Prætorium*) of Herod (cf. Schürer, I, ii, p. 48f.; Acts, 23 : 35), a fortified structure on the Western hill; or in the Antonia, the citadel adjoining the Temple (cf. Westcott, on Jn. 18 : 28; 19 : 13; Swete, on Mk. 15 : 16), where the troops, always present in the city, were quartered (cf. Acts 21 : 31). Pontius Pilate, the fifth in the series, was appointed in 25-26 A.D. His rule, as represented both by Josephus (*Antig.* xviii; *Jewish War*, ii, 9, 2ff.) and by Philo (*De Leg.* 38), was one of

2. him away, and delivered him up to Pilate. And Pilate asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews? And
3. he answering saith unto him, Thou sayest. And the
4. chief priests accused him of many things. And Pilate again asked him, saying, Answerest thou nothing?
5. behold how many things they accuse thee of. But Jesus no more answered anything; insomuch that Pilate marvelled.

corruption and cruelty (cf. Lk. 13 : 1); although the Gospel record of his conduct in the case of Jesus shows him to have been not utterly destitute of the sense of justice, while vacillating in will and dominated by a regard for his own interests.

2-5. **Art thou the King of the Jews?**: We have here the first intimation of the results reached in the consultation of the Council. Laying aside the religious character of his confession of Messiahship, they had formulated it into a claim of political kingship over the Jews—the precise thing which in his Ministry he had declined to entertain, and declining had alienated the populace and embittered the leaders. Luke, who throughout the Passion narrative is evidently relying on other and more detailed sources than Mark, gives us the form in which the charge was laid before Pilate: “We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar and saying that he himself is Christ a King”—or as in margin—“an anointed King” (23 : 2) and the penalty they demanded: “worthy of death” (23 : 15). The Fourth Gospel phrases it in a purely general way: “If this man were not an evil doer, we should not have delivered him up to thee” (18 : 30). In addition to this charge of political kingship, **the chief priests**, who did not hesitate to lay aside the dignity of their office in personally appearing before the Roman official, **accused him of many things**, which probably refer to the additional items involved in the charge as given by Luke (23 : 2, 5). To Pilate’s question Jesus replied **Thou sayest**; for to deny this claim, or to ignore it, however falsely his accusers had emphasized it, would have been to disown in a significantly public way his mission to his people. But to the detailed charges of the priests, utterly distorted and falsified as from Luke’s record (23 : 2) we see they were, he answered nothing **insomuch that Pilate marvelled**. The Fourth Gospel elaborates Jesus’ reply to Pilate’s question into a dialogue between the Prisoner and the official (18 : 34-38), but, with Luke, says nothing of the refusal to answer the varied charges of the priests. From Luke (23 : 4) and John (18 : 38) we learn that Pilate

6. Now at the feast he used to release unto them one
7. prisoner, whom they asked of him. And there was one called Barabbas, *lying* bound with them that had made insurrection, men who in the insurrection had
8. committed murder. And the multitude went up and began to ask him *to do* as he was wont to do unto them.

was not impressed with the charges, and gave it as his opinion that there was no fault to be found with the Prisoner. But, as Luke adds (23 : 5-16), the priests having reiterated their charges with increased bitterness and having mentioned Galilee as included in the field of Jesus' activities, Pilate sent him with his accusers to Herod, who was in Jerusalem at that time, and close at hand, if Pilate was staying in his palace (see notes on ver. 1). Herod, however, having discovered nothing against him, Pilate summoned the accusers before him and gave his judgment that the Prisoner had done nothing worthy of death; so that he would simply scourge him and let him go. According to the Fourth Gospel, the examination of the Prisoner apparently was held within the building, the judgments being given from a tribunal set up, either in the inner court of the building, if it was Herod's palace, or on a cleared space without the building if it was the Antonia. The Fourth Gospel refers to it as "a place called the Pavement, but in Hebrew Gabbatha" (19 : 13; cf. 18 : 29, 33, 38; 19 : 4f., 9).

6-15. **At the feast** (lit. *at a feast, at feast time*) **he used to release . . . one prisoner**: This custom, which was confined to the Passover (cf. Jn. 18 : 39) and apparently to Pilate's administration (cf. Matt. 27 : 15), is of unknown origin. While it does not seem in accord with Pilate's reputed harshness of rule, it may be evidence of his willingness at times to offset his cruelty with small acts of generosity. He was in bad enough favor with his subjects to make such a course of action at least good policy and such concessions were not contrary to the custom of the Roman dealings with the Jews at this time (cf. Schürer, I, ii, pp. 87-89). **Whom they asked of him**: The people were apparently allowed to name the prisoner to be released, the privilege, of course, being limited by the nature of his offence. **Barabbas** (Aram. *Bar-Abba*, 'Son of the Father,' or 'of the Teacher,' a patronymic): From the statement here given there is no reason to understand that Barabbas was a robber (as Jn. 18 : 40). or even that he had gone to the length of murder (as Lk. 23 : 19; Acts 3 : 14) in the riot in which he had participated. From ver. 11 (cf. Matt. 27 : 16), he was apparently well known and popular. In accordance with this custom, the people who had begun to assemble

9. And Pilate answered them, saying, Will ye that I
 10. release unto you the King of the Jews? For he perceived that for envy the chief priests had delivered
 11. him up. But the chief priests stirred up the multitude, that he should rather release Barabbas unto
 12. them. And Pilate again answered and said unto them,
 What then shall I do unto him whom ye call the King

before Pilate's quarters, presented their petition that a prisoner be released to them. Pilate, seeing here a way out of his difficulty, asked them if he should release **the king of the Jews**, feeling sure that the chief priests were moved against the Prisoner out of **envy** of his power with the people and believing that the people would be patriotically aroused in favor of one who had been politically accused before the Government. The Fourth Gospel represents Pilate as himself reminding the populace of this amnesty custom and suggesting that it issue in favor of Jesus (18 : 39). Following Pilate's inquiry as to whether in carrying out the custom he should release Jesus, there apparently was a period of deliberation on the people's part, during which **the chief priests** ("and the elders," Matt. 27 : 20) **stirred them up to ask that he should rather release Barabbas unto them**. The period, however, is not likely to have been long, for the task was not after all a difficult one. Popular expectation of some political announcement had been strong at Jesus' public entry into the city; but the enthusiasm then manifested had not been sustained. Four days had passed and nothing had happened. On the day after his entry he had indeed dramatically cleansed the Temple, and on the following day he had been in keen controversy with the religious leaders; but since then he had practically retired from public notice, and now he stood before them a helpless prisoner, charged with blasphemy by the priests and treated by Pilate with a pitying political contempt. There really was not much in his case to arouse their patriotism; Barabbas, the insurrectionist, appealed to them far more, and, whether his name was the one they had had first in mind to present, or whether it was now first suggested to them by the priests, they were, with no great difficulty, persuaded to prefer it to that of Jesus, and it was so presented to Pilate. Possibly, it was during this period of deliberation by the people that Pilate's wife sent to him the cautionary message recorded by Matthew (27 : 19). **Crucify him** (Luke gives it as repeated, 23 : 21): Their impassioned cry, as Pilate further questioned them what he was then to do with Jesus, was of course in accordance with the directions of the priests;

13. of the Jews? And they cried out again, Crucify him.
14. And Pilate said unto them, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out exceedingly, Crucify him.
15. And Pilate, wishing to content the multitude, released unto them Barabbas, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged him, to be crucified.

but it doubtless was emphasized by the resentment felt at the Governor's sarcastic implication—itself suggested by his surprised disappointment at their choice—that Jesus was one whom they had already accepted as their king (cf. 11 : 9f.; Lk. 19 : 38). His question naturally was not intended to leave with the mob the determination of the punishment to be given in the case; it was rather an expostulation with them against giving over to punishment at all one who was not guilty of any crime, so that their wild answering shout, condemning Jesus to an ignominious death, was doubtless to Pilate not only an additional, but a startling surprise, and once more and with evident heat he brought to them the injustice of their demand. But this seemed only to anger them to reckless wildness and they **cried out exceedingly** (lit. *shouted with exceeding vehemence*) **Crucify him**. Mark—followed practically by Luke (33 : 23-25)—closes the scene with the simple statement that **Pilate, wishing to content the multitude, i.e. on a pure policy of government expediency, released unto them Barabbas, and delivered Jesus when he had scourged him, to be crucified**. Matthew adds that when Pilate saw that further reasoning with the mob was useless, he washed his hands before them, as a public attestation of his blamelessness for the sentence and that the people publicly accepted it as responsibly due to them (27 : 24f.). The Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, gives no record of this expostulation, but narrates in detail the closing of the scene, which, as it presents it, is determined solely on grounds of Pilate's personal interest. This narrative includes not only the mocking by the soldiers—which appears in the Synoptists as an incident following the delivering up of the Prisoner to his fate—but also a further fruitless appeal of Pilate to the crowd, followed by an ironical suggestion that if they insisted on a sentence of death, they should execute it themselves—a thing legally impossible, as both Pilate and the people knew. To this the accusers reply that if the Prisoner be not guilty in the Governor's sight, he is in theirs, since he "made himself the Son of God," and their law must be carried out. This leads to a further private examination of the Prisoner by Pilate, the outcome of which is a further effort on the Governor's part to release him. At this, the accusers make the threat that such

16. And the soldiers led him away within the court, which is the ¹ Prætorium; and they call together the
 17. whole ² band. And they clothe him with purple, and
 18. plattng a crown of thorns, they put it on him; and
 19. they began to salute him, Hail, King of the Jews! And
 they smote his head with a reed, and spat upon him,
 20. and bowing their knees worshipped him. And when
 they had mocked him, they took off from him the
 purple, and put on him his garments. And they lead
 him out to crucify him.

¹ palace.

² cohort.

action would be a proper basis of complaint at Rome against the Governor's loyalty to the Emperor. Whereupon Pilate practically gives up the struggle, bringing the Prisoner out before the people, and, with a supreme contempt for them as well as for him, presenting him to them as their king. Upon this, they demand again his death and when Pilate asks with a sneer whether they will have him crucify their king, they reply with what perhaps was the greatest of all the lies to which the situation had forced them, "We have no king but Cæsar." Thereupon, Jesus is delivered up to death (19 : 1-16).

16-20. **Led him away within the court:** The scourging, which was exceedingly painful and sometimes followed by death, was ordinarily inflicted by lictors, but, as Pilate had no such officials, it must have been carried out in this instance by his soldiers (cf. Matt. 27 : 27). Apparently, it took place outside the building, before the mob; since, after it was over, the soldiers took the Prisoner into the inner court of what Mark's narrative (cf. also Matt. 27 : 27) regards as **the Prætorium**, or official residence of the Governor in the city (cf. Jn. 18 : 28, 33; 19 : 9)—whether this was the palace of Herod (cf. Acts 23 : 35), or the Antonia, where the city troops were quartered. (cf. Acts 21 : 31, see notes on ver. 1). **There they call together the whole band**—the cohort, made up of provincial troops—excepting Jews who were exempt—and numbering at least 500, which constituted the city garrison. Those who had done the scourging let it be known that the Prisoner is the reputed king of the despised Jews and summon their comrades to have sport with him. They strip off his outer garments (cf. Matt. 27 : 28) and **clothe him with purple**. Matthew gives it more precisely, "a scarlet robe," or *chlamys*, a short cloak worn by soldiers, officers, and rulers—perhaps a cast-off

21. And they ¹ compel one passing by, Simon of Cyrene, coming from the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to go *with them*, that he might bear his cross.

¹ *impress.*

piece of apparel, with enough color in it to make it all the more a mockery (cf. Swete, *ad loc.*). John calls it simply "a purple garment," 19 : 2. Luke does not record the mocking at all. Then they plaited a crown of thorns—doubtless from the brushwood kept in the court for the customary fire (cf. 14 : 54; Jn. 18 : 18, Menzies, *ad loc.*)—and put it on him and began to salute (lit. greet, acclaim) him, Hail, King of the Jews! But mockery not being enough, they proceeded to brutality and smote his head with a reed, which Matthew states they had first placed in his hand as a sceptre (27 : 29; John says "they struck him with their hands," margin "with rods," 19 : 3), and then, instead of the kiss of homage, they spat upon him and with supreme contempt bowing their knees worshipped him. Matthew connects this mock homage with their royal acclaiming of him (27 : 29). John makes no reference to it at all, and records the whole incident as taking place with the scourging (19 : 1f.). After their brutal scorn had satisfied itself, the soldiers reclothe him with his own garments and lead him out to crucify him.

(8) *The Crucifixion, 15 : 21-41*

21. **Compel** (lit. to employ one as a courier or messenger, a Persian word, cf. Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 86f. *Expositor*, January, 1908, p. 54; cf. also Matt. 5 : 41, where the same word is used): The Persian couriers, stationed by relays at various localities, had authority in case of need to commandeer horses, vessels, and men for the furthering of the royal messages on their way. Here, this passing stranger was pressed into the service of carrying the cross—i.e. the cross piece, the upright being permanently fixed in the ground, in the place of the Prisoner, who was too weakened by the experiences of the night and the scourging just inflicted to bear (Jn. 19 : 17), as sentenced criminals were compelled to do, the instruments of their execution. **Simon of Cyrene . . . father of Alexander and Rufus**: Cyrene was a city of North Africa, in which a colony of Jews had been settled in the time of Ptolemy I. This stranger was doubtless in attendance upon the Passover (cf. Acts 2 : 10; 6 : 9; 13 : 1, and was coming into the city from the country—not the tilled fields or farms, as in 6 : 36, but the general region outside the city. If the Rufus here referred to is to be identified with the Rufus saluted by Paul in Rom. 16 : 13 (cf. Sanday *ad loc.*), the reason for Mark's mention of him

22. And they bring him unto the place Golgotha, which
 23. is, being interpreted, The place of a skull. And
 they offered him wine mingled with myrrh: but he
 24. received it not. And they crucify him, and part his
 garments among them, casting lots upon them, what
 25. each should take. And it was the third hour, and

in this general way, as one who would be well known to his readers, may be found in the fact that he was writing his Gospel for Christians in Rome. Matthew and Luke omit the reference to the sons and the Fourth Gospel has no record of the incident at all. Luke introduces here the somewhat improbable statement of the following crowds and wailing women and Jesus' remarks to the latter on the way (23 : 27-31).

22. Golgotha [Transliteration of the Aramaic word, *Gulgôthas*, Jn. 10 : 17, meaning *a skull* (cf. Lk. 23 : 33)]: The place was near the city (Jn. 10 : 20), and, doubtless for the sake of the impression to be made by the execution, a place that was easily in view of the passing public (ver. 20, Lk. 23 : 33); in fact, prominent enough to be visible from afar (ver. 20; Lk. 23 : 40). Whether the traditional site, within the space covered by the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in the N. W. quarter of the modern city, is correct depends upon the location of the second North City wall mentioned by Josephus *Bell. Jud.* V, iv, 2. If this wall ran inside this region, the site is likely to be correct, as it is confirmed by continuous tradition from the time of Constantine (So *Hastings* [single vol.] *Bible Dict.*, art. Golgotha. See also Sanday, *Sacred Sites*, pp. 53-55). If it ran outside of it, then there is no place which will commend itself as its location (So *Standard Bible Dict.*, art. Jerusalem, §§ 30 and 25).

23-25. They (not the soldiers, but some merciful bystanders) offered him wine mingled with myrrh (Matthew says "gall," 27 : 34, perhaps due to Ps. 69 : 21—not to deaden the sense of pain, for this would not be its effect, but to increase the warming and stimulating effect of the wine. But "when he had tasted it" (Matt. 27 : 34), he refused it. He would drain the cup which the Father had offered him to the full. The incident is omitted by both Luke and the Fourth Gospel. They crucify him: The generally followed method of crucifixion was to lay the prisoner on the ground and upon the cross piece, which had been thrust under his shoulders, the arms were then stretched out, and the hands nailed to its extremities (Jn. 20 : 25). So fastened, the body was lifted up and the cross piece nailed to the upright already fixed in the ground, the body resting on a piece of wood attached to the upright as on a saddle. The feet

26. they crucified him. And the superscription of his accusation was written over, **THE KING OF THE JEWS.**

also were probably nailed to the upright (Lk. 24 : 39f.). So erected, the cross stood not more than nine feet high, the body being within easy reach from the ground (cf. ver. 36). **Part his garments among them, casting lots upon them:** This was the customary disposal of the victim's apparel. The Fourth Gospel has a more detailed account of how the garments were divided, seeing in it a fulfilment of the Scripture in Ps. 22 : 18; (19 : 23f.). This disposal of Jesus' garments he follows with the incident of the women at the Cross and Jesus' tender committal of his Mother to the care of the disciple whom he loved (vs. 25-27). As, however, this is the only incident he records between the first and the last moments of the crucifixion, it can only be conjectured at what time in the interval it occurred (see below for the Synoptist's reference to the presence of the women, Mk., ver. 40; Matt., ver. 56; Lk., ver. 49). **It was the third hour** (so alone Mark)—*i.e.* 9 A. M., according to the Jewish method of reckoning the hours of the day from sunrise to sunset. The Fourth Gospel gives the time at which the sentence was finally passed upon the Prisoner as "about the sixth hour" (19 : 14), or about 6 A. M., if the Roman method of reckoning from midnight to midnight is followed (see Edersheim, *Temple*, p. 174; but also note the probability of an error in the text of the Fourth Gospel, *Expository Times*, Jan. 1909, p. 183f.). Luke here introduces the first word from the Cross, which is recorded only by him, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (23 : 24).

26. **The superscription of his accusation:** The name of the criminal with the crime for which he had been condemned was inscribed on a board, which was carried before him, or suspended from his neck, as he went to execution and affixed to the cross over his head (Matt. 27 : 37). The form of the inscription given in the Fourth Gospel, "JESUS OF NAZARETH, THE KING OF THE JEWS," (19 : 19), as containing the name and the place is thus to be preferred to the shortened form given in Mark, **THE KING OF THE JEWS**, followed practically by Luke (23 : 38), and even to that given in Matthew which omits the local designation, "THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS" (27 : 37). The Fourth Gospel states that the title was determined by Pilate and that "it was written in Hebrew and in Latin and in Greek" (19 : 19f.)—Latin being the official language, Greek the common speech, and these being preceded by Hebrew, evidently in order that all the Jews, whether bilingual or not, might smart in public for what they had compelled him to do. That they did smart is clear from what the Fourth Gospel adds of the petition to Pilate by the chief priests that the wording be changed so that

27. And with him they crucify two robbers; one on his right hand, and one on his left.¹ And they that
 29. passed by railed on him, wagging their heads, and saying, Ha! thou that destroyest the ² temple, and

¹ Many MSS. insert ver. 28, *And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, And he was reckoned with transgressors.*
² sanctuary.

this Jewish kingship should not be stated as a fact, but as a claim on the Prisoner's part—a request which Pilate grimly refused (19 : 21f.).

27. **Two robbers** (Luke, "malefactors," 23 : 33)—outlaws, brigands, desperate characters and not to be classed with thieves. At the same time, the word does not designate them as necessarily insurrectionists and therefore of the crowd with which Barabbas had been connected (ver. 7). The Fourth Gospel refers to the fact that there were two others crucified with Jesus, but makes no mention of the character of their crime (19 : 18). Verse 28 is not part of the original text and is, consequently, omitted.

29-32. **They that passed by**—not necessarily those of the mob that had demanded Jesus' death, but persons passing to and from the city along the public road, near which the crosses had been erected. They doubtless knew generally of Jesus as hated by the religious leaders and had heard the report of the charge made against him at the Council trial. To them it was a shamefully boastful claim that he could destroy the sacred Temple and build it again in three days—a claim absurdly mocked by his present helpless condition, and their fanaticism burst forth in insulting cries and deriding gestures; for their suggestion that he save himself and **come down from the cross** was not so much a challenge to his miraculous powers as a taunt at his lack of them. **The chief priests mocking him among themselves:** Although it was a feast day the priests and scribes and elders (Matt. 27 : 41) were out at the place of crucifixion, aside perhaps from the passing crowd and refraining from directly railing at the victim, but exulting among themselves at the evident justification of their opposition to his Messianic claims. **He saved others** from disease and death and held this power as proof of his Messiahship (Matt. 11 : 2-6); but now **himself he cannot save** from this death to which we have brought him. If he be **the Christ**, the King of Israel he claimed to be, let him **now come down from the cross, that we may see and believe**—not that they would have believed even if they had seen him come down from his hopeless place; for the condition of their belief in Jesus was not the mere exhibition of miraculous power—they admitted that he had already shown himself possessed of that—but of miraculous power applied to political and revolutionary ends,

30. buildest it in three days, save thyself, and come down
 31. from the cross. In like manner also the chief priests
 mocking *him* among themselves with the scribes said,
 32. He saved others; ¹ himself he cannot save. Let the
 Christ, the King of Israel, now come down from the
 cross, that we may see and believe. And they that
 were crucified with him reproached him.
 33. And when the sixth hour was come, there was
 darkness over the whole ² land until the ninth hour.

¹ can he not save himself?² Earth.

and even then their belief would have been only such as would have committed to him the cause of their religious nationalism. That he could not save himself for such a purpose was their unconscious testimony to the spiritual character of his mission to the world. Matthew adds that they quoted against him a passage from the 22d Psalm (27 : 43); while Luke, though he does not mention the public raillery, states that the soldiers joined with the priests and scribes in their derision, offering him vinegar—the sour wine of laborers (Ruth 2 : 14) and of the common soldier—in sport at his sufferings (23 : 36). **They that were crucified with him reproached him:** With them it was not the sneering disbelief of the crowd, nor the jubilant mockery of the priests, but the bitter reproach of those whose fellow sufferings his helplessness could not relieve. Luke states that one of the malefactors rebuked his comrade, reminding him of their own guilt as contrasted with Jesus' innocence, and appealing to Jesus to be remembered when he came into possession of his kingdom—an appeal to which Jesus replied with the memorable words, "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (23 : 39-43). The Fourth Gospel makes no reference to the general incident of mocking, in any of its phases.

33. **Sixth hour**—twelve o'clock, noon. **Darkness over the whole land:** It is not necessary to consider this a supernatural event. Nor could it have been an eclipse of the sun, with the Paschal moon at its full, and it is not likely to have been the darkness preceding an earthquake, the mention of which in Matthew (27 : 51-53) is due to legendary influences. It may have resulted from purely local causes, such as the wind storms mentioned by Furrer in his *Wanderungen*, p. 175f., which in this region occur at times in the last weeks of Spring, deeply clouding the heavens till the sunlight finally disappears. At the same time, it naturally impressed the disciples, not only as

34. And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice,
 Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, ¹ why hast thou forsaken
 35. me? And some of them that stood by, when they
 36. heard it, said, Behold, he calleth Elijah. And one ran,
 and filling a sponge full of vinegar, put it on a reed,
 and gave him to drink, saying, Let be; let us see

¹ Why didst thou forsake me?

portentous, but as divinely connected with the shameful event which was taking place—the prophecies of Joel (2 : 31) and Amos (8 : 9f.) readily occurring to them—while, for ourselves, however natural we may consider its cause, we cannot but recognize an agreement between its character and the awful event in connection with which it occurred. **The whole land**—of Judaea—**until the ninth hour**, i.e. 3 P. M.

34-36. **Jesus cried . . . Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani:** This is the Aramaic form of the opening words of the 22d Psalm, the Hebrew form of which is partially preserved in the marginal readings to this passage and its parallel in Mt. 27 : 46. It would seem that in this instance Jesus must have used wholly the Hebrew language; since it was only this form of the first two words ("Eli, Eli") which would have suggested to the bystanders that he was calling upon Elijah (ver. 35) and he would not have mixed his speech. The agony which Jesus had experienced in the Garden, as he looked forward to the inevitable expression which sin would give to its hatred of the love of God, wrung from his lips this cry of anguish, as the full realization of this hatred closed down upon him. It was not the cry of despair, as though he had become conscious of the Father's withdrawal of fellowship with him, for there was no such withdrawal, but the cry of faith expostulating against despair, as he summoned his conviction of that fellowship against all the perceptible signs of its withdrawal (See Hogg, *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*, p. 193f. with Garvie, in the *Expositor*, June, 1907, pp. 507-527.) **Some of them that stood by**—not the soldiers, who would not understand the language, nor to whom the sounds would have had any scriptural suggestion—**said, Behold, he calleth Elijah:** The helpless sufferer's supposed calling upon the Prophet, who was held to be "a deliverer in time of trouble" (cf. 1 Kings 17 : 8-24) excites anew their derision, though perhaps with a certain amount of superstitious interest. **One of the crowd**, doubtless hearing Jesus' cry of thirst (Jn. 19 : 29), **ran, and filling a sponge full of vinegar**—the soldier's sour wine or *posca*—from a jar that stood near (Jn. 19 :

37. whether Elijah cometh to take him down. And
 38. Jesus uttered a loud voice, and gave up the ghost. And
 the veil of the ¹ temple was rent in two from the top
 39. to the bottom. And when the centurion, who stood

¹ sanctuary.

29), put it on a reed ("hyssop," Jn. 19 : 29—a plant of uncertain identification. See article in *Standard Bible Dictionary*) and gave him to drink. The sponge and reed were frequently taken by the guard to the place of crucifixion for use in such emergencies. In the present case, however, it was a self interested rather than a merciful act; for as the bystander carried it to the cross he said, **Let be; let us see whether Elijah cometh to take him down**—resenting an interference with his action from the rest of the crowd, with the idea that by prolonging the sufferer's life there would be a chance to see whether the Prophet would come to his rescue. According to Matthew (27 : 49), it is the crowd that seeks to prevent the giving of the relieving drink, in a more excited interest in what might possibly happen. Luke makes no reference to the incident.

37. And Jesus uttered a loud voice—similar to his cry of desolation in its agony, but different from it in its cause—and gave up the ghost (lit. *expired*. So Lk. 23 : 46; Matthew, "yielded up his spirit," 27 : 50): Two utterances of Jesus are recorded in this final moment—one by Luke who states that this agonizing cry was followed by the words which, beautiful in themselves, are also significant of Jesus' restored assurance of communion with God, "Father, into thy hand I commend my spirit" (23 : 46); the other by John, who records that Jesus, having accepted the proffered drink, gave expression to what must have been, not merely the supreme relief, but the glorious triumph of his accomplished work, "It is finished" (19 : 30; see Garvie, *Inner Life*, p. 424f.). This was the end of his earthly mission; but with it was ushered in the beginning of that heavenly ministry which will continue until the Kingdom of God is finally consummated in the perfecting of this human world.

38. The veil of the temple was rent—the veil which separated the Holy Place from the Most Holy Place, the rending of which was considered in the thought of the Early Church symbolical of the believer's freedom of access to God through the sacrifice of Christ (cf. Heb. 10 : 19f.; 6 : 18-20). Luke places this before the death, in connection with the darkness at the sixth hour (23 : 45), Matthew follows Mark in assigning it to the moment of his death, but connects with it the earthquake and the opening of the graves which he records as happening at that time (27 : 51-53).

by over against him, saw that he ¹so gave up the ghost,
 40. he said, Truly this man was the Son of God. And there
 were also women beholding from afar: among whom
 were both Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of
 41. ²James the ³less and of Joses, and Salome; who,
 when he was in Galilee, followed him, and ministered
 unto him; and many other women that came up with
 him unto Jerusalem.

¹ Many MSS. read *so cried out, and gave up the ghost.*

² *Jacob.*

³ *Grk. the little.*

39. **The centurion**—in charge of the soldiers detailed to carry out the crucifixion. **Stood over against him**—facing the cross, in watch over the proceedings, **saw that he so gave up the ghost** (lit. *expired*; cf. ver. 37)—so differently from ordinary victims, particularly in the strength and conscious triumph of the last moments, which would be likely to impress a Roman. According to Matthew, who associates with the centurion the soldiers of the guard, the impression was made by the earthquake and other portents and was one of superstitious fear (27 : 54). Luke confines the impression to the centurion, but assigns its cause generally to all that had taken place (23 : 47). **This man was the Son of God** (lit. *a son of God*): This phrase, even if caught up from the railery of the mob and the priests (cf. Matt. 27 : 40, 43), could not have been meant in a Messianic sense as the Messianic meaning of it by those who used it would not have been intelligible to him. It expressed, at the utmost, the conviction that the Victim was really something more than human, much after the manner of the similar phrase in Dan. 3 : 25. Matthew follows Mark in the phrasing of the expression (27 : 54); Luke generalizes and lowers it into “a righteous man,” but adds a statement that remorse settled upon the crowds as they left the scene (23 : 47f.). John does not record the incident.

40, 41. **Women beholding afar off**—at a safe distance from the mocking crowd, but near enough to watch the sufferer in sympathy with his agony, if not to render relief. **Mary Magdalene**—i.e. the woman of Magdala, a town on the Western shore of the Lake of Galilee, halfway between Capernaum and Tiberias. She is referred to by Luke (8 : 2; cf. addition to Mark's Gospel, 16 : 9) as having been cured of severe demonic possession, upon the nature of which will depend the traditional identification of her with the sinful woman of Lk. 7 : 37. **Mary the mother of James the less and of**

42. And when even was now come, because it was the
 43. Preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath, there

Joses (Matthew omits "the less," 27 : 56; cf. Mk. 15 : 47; 16 : 1; Lk. 24 : 10): If "Clopas" (Jn. 19 : 25)—but not "Cleopas" (Lk. 24 : 18)—is to be taken as another transliteration of the Aramaic of "Alphæus,"—which is questioned—then this Mary may have been the wife of Alphæus and the James here mentioned the second James of the Apostolic circle. **Salome**: From the parallel passage in Matthew (27 : 56), this would appear to be the name of the wife of Zebedee, and may be the name of the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, referred to in Jn. 19 : 25. Whether the designation of this James as "the less" refers to age, stature, or importance, is not known. (On these names, see articles in *Standard Bible Dictionary*.) Luke does not give the names of the women, but states that with them were "all his acquaintance," which possibly, though not probably, may include the eleven (23 : 49). John has no record of the fact. **Followed him and ministered unto him**: Mark makes no reference to this fact in his record of the Galilean ministry, as Luke does (8 : 1-3), nor in his record of the journey to Jerusalem, as is incidentally done by Matthew (20 : 20).

(9) *The Burial, 15 : 42-47*

42. **Even**—a general term, covering the later part of the afternoon until sunset, and from sunset until the beginning of night (cf. Matt. 14 : 15 with 23; Ex. 12 : 6, margin). As Jesus did not die until three o'clock, and time must be allowed for Joseph's petition to the Governor and the official verification of death, as well as for the preparations after the petition had been granted (vs. 43-46), the taking down of the body must have occurred well on towards six o'clock. **The Preparation**: This began at three o'clock and continued until sunset (cf. Josephus, *Ant.*, xvi, 6; 2), though the entire day came to be known as the Preparation. For the sake of his Gentile readers, Mark more nearly describes it as the **day before the Sabbath**. Before Jesus expired the Jews had gone to Pilate to ask that the death of the victims might be hastened, so that their bodies might be taken away (Jn. 19 : 31); for the law did not permit the body of a criminal to be left unburied over night (Deut. 21 : 23), and this night would be the beginning of a Sabbath, and this Sabbath was "a high day;" for it was not only the seventh day of the week, but the second Paschal Day, on which the "Wave-sheaf" was offered to the Lord (cf. Edersheim, *Jesus*, ii. 613). This order was given, and the legs of the two malefactors were broken, but Jesus was found to be already dead (Jn. 19 : 32f.).

43-46. Nevertheless, the body of Jesus doubtless would have shared with the others the common grave of the criminal had there

came Joseph of Arimathæa, a councillor of honorable estate, who also himself was looking for the kingdom of God; and he boldly went in unto Pilate, and asked
 44. for the body of Jesus. And Pilate marvelled if he were already dead: and calling unto him the centurion, he asked him whether he had been any while dead.

not come a friend, **Joseph of Arimathea** (probably the Ramah, or Ramathaim-zophim, of the hill-country of Ephraim, the birthplace of Samuel [1 Sam. 1 : 1 with 19], a few miles north of Jerusalem), a **councillor** (a member of the Jerusalem Sanhedrin), who, however, had not consented to the action of the Council against Jesus (Lk. 23 : 51), **of honorable estate**, *i.e.* of the better class (cf. Acts 13 : 50; 17 : 12), which doubtless implied the possession of wealth (Matthew calls him "a rich man," 27 : 57), who **was looking for the kingdom of God** (so Luke who also speaks of him as "a good and righteous man," 23 : 50), one of the "pious," like Simeon (Lk. 2 : 25), who had a confident hope in a Messianic coming which would be a religious blessing to the people of God. This statement of Mark's might possibly agree with John's record that he was "a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews" (19 : 38), but certainly not with the unqualified designation of him by Matthew as one "who also himself was Jesus' disciple" (27 : 57). He doubtless accepted with satisfaction Jesus' announcement of the nearness of the kingdom and hoped to see it realized by him, though he feared to commit himself to Jesus' following. But now he went **boldly** (*lit. having gathered courage*)—as was quite necessary, in view of Pilate's characteristic behaviour towards the Jews, but quite possible, in view of Joseph's position and wealth—and **asked for the body of Jesus**, to save it from committal to the criminal's grave. Pilate's doubting surprise that Jesus was **already dead** was due to his knowledge of the lingering torture which generally accompanied crucifixion, and indicates that Joseph must have presented his petition soon enough after the Jews' request had been granted for Pilate to recognize that death had preceded the carrying out of his order to hasten it. He seeks to verify the fact implied in the petition and summons **the centurion** to whom he had given the order, to ascertain from him whether Jesus **had been any while** (*properly were already*) **dead** when he reached the cross on his errand. Having ascertained the facts, **he granted the corpse to Joseph**. This incident of Pilate's surprise and official verification of the death is given alone by Mark. **Bought a linen cloth**: While purchases were not permitted on the Paschal days, it is possible that the necessities connected with death and

45. And when he learned it of the centurion, he granted
 46. the corpse to Joseph. And he bought a linen cloth,
 and taking him down, wound him in the linen cloth,
 and laid him in a tomb which had been hewn out of a
 rock; and he rolled a stone against the door of the
 47. tomb. And Mary Magdalene and Mary the *mother*
 of Joses beheld where he was laid.

burial overruled the law of the feast (cf. 16 : 1). The cloth must have been a piece of considerable size and, according to Matthew (27 : 59), was "clean," *i.e.* fresh and unused. **Taking him down**—not the body itself, as represented in Rubens' famous picture, but the cross piece to which the body was affixed, which was laid on the ground and the body removed from it. The body was then **wound in the cloth**, and hurriedly carried to a nearby **tomb** (John specifies that it was in a garden "in the place where he was crucified," 19 : 41) . . . **hewn out of a rock**. (According to Matthew, Joseph's own tomb, which was new, 27 : 60; Lk. 23 : 53, and Jn. 19 : 41, adding that it was one in which no one had yet been laid): Possibly, on account of the shortness of time at their disposal, this was intended merely as a temporary resting place for the body until the Sabbath was over (cf. Jn. 19 : 42). These caves were furnished with a court, eight or nine feet square, around which, or in a lower cave behind which, were insertions into the rock at right angles to the wall for depositing the bodies (cf. Edersheim, *Jesus*, ii, p. 617; *Jewish Social Life*, p. 171f.). In this court, doubtless, the body was unwrapped and, as the Fourth Gospel intimates, the cloth torn into strips ("cloths") and with intermingled "spices" brought by Joseph's fellow-Sandehrist, Nicodemus, bound up again, "as the custom of the Jews is to bury" (Jn. 19 : 40, see notes on 14 : 8). **Rolled a stone against the door of the tomb**: This stone was circular in form. It moved along a groove slightly depressed at the center, where it would be held in position against the opening (cf. Hastings' single vol. *Bible Dictionary*, art. Tomb).

47. **Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses**: The two Marys mentioned in ver. 40 as among the women at the Cross are here referred to as having evidently remained to witness the final disposition made of the body. From their report, doubtless, the further service narrated in 16 : 1 was determined upon (cf. Lk. 23 : 56). Matthew here inserts his account of the request made by the chief priests and the Pharisees that Pilate should seal the sepulchre and set a guard of soldiers to watch over it until the third day (27 : 62-66),

16. And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the *mother* of ¹ James, and Salome, bought
2. spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early on the first day of the week, they come to
 3. the tomb when the sun was risen. And they were saying among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone
 4. from the door of the tomb? and looking up, they see that the stone is rolled back: for it was exceeding great.

¹ *Jacob.*

giving later, at the close of his account of the experiences of the women, his statement of their report to the chief priests of what had happened and the bribery of the soldiers to silence by the chief priests and elders (28 : 11-15).

(10) *The Visit of the Women to the Tomb, 16 : 1-8*

16 : 1. **When the Sabbath was past**—i.e. after sunset—**Mary Magdalene and Mary the Mother of James and Salome**: see note on 15 : 47. Luke substitutes "Joanna" for Salome and adds "the other women with them" (24 : 10; cf. 8 : 3). Matthew restricts the group to "Mary Magdalene and the other Mary" (28 : 1); while John gives only "Mary Magdalene" (20 : 1). **Bought spices** (lit. *aromatics*): Luke adds "ointments" (23 : 56) and states that they were prepared by the women on their return from witnessing the burial, which, however, is unlikely, if intended to be taken strictly as applying to the afternoon of Friday; since it was too near the sunset which ushered in the Sabbath to allow for a return to the city and a purchase and preparation of the material before the beginning of the sacred day. **Anoint him**—not in the way of embalming, which was an Egyptian custom and not practised by the Jews (see notes on 14 : 8), but an external application, supplementing the hasty work of Joseph and Nicodemus on Friday afternoon.

2-4. **Very early . . . when the sun was risen**: Luke says "at early dawn" (24 : 1); John, "while it was yet dark" (20 : 1); Matthew, "late on the Sabbath day (lit. *late from the Sabbath day*; cf. Moulton *Gram. N. T. Greek*, p. 72f.), as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week." (Cf. Burkitt, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1913, pp. 538-546.) These variant statements, confusing though they are, make certain that the time was in the early hours of the morning (cf. Andrews, *Life of our Lord*, p. 598f.). **Who shall roll us away the stone?**: Apparently, they have no knowledge of the guard at

5. And entering into the tomb, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, arrayed in a white robe;
6. and they were amazed. And he saith unto them, Be not amazed: ye seek Jesus, the Nazarene, who hath been crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold,
7. the place where they laid him! But go, tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee:

the tomb (cf. Matt. 27 : 62-66). Their anxiety was confined to the removal of the stone, which would need more than their combined strength (cf. ver. 4). But as they approached the tomb, they looked up and saw that the stone had been **rolled back**, in spite of the fact that it was **exceeding great**. Matthew accounts for this by an earthquake and angelic forces (28 : 2).

5-7. **Entering into the tomb**, *i.e.* its antechamber, or court (see note on 15 : 53). John has no intimation of this nearer investigation (20 : 1f.). **A young man sitting on the right side**, *i.e.* of the court—not of the space in the wall in which the body had been laid; since these were not niches parallel to the wall but insertions into the wall at right angles to it. (See note on 15 : 53.) The “right side” is intended as the place of honor. **Arrayed in a white robe** and therefore a heavenly being (cf. Rev. 3 : 4f.; 7 : 13, *etc.*). Matthew definitely describes the person as an angel “whose appearance was as lightning and his raiment white as snow,” and says he was seated on the stone outside the tomb (28 : 2f.); Luke mentions “two men . . . in dazzling apparel,” who appeared to the women, not upon their entering the tomb, but afterwards as they stood perplexed at not finding the body of Jesus (24 : 4). John makes no mention of angelic appearances. **Amazed** (lit. *utterly amazed*): Luke says “affrighted” (24 : 5). The angel removes their perplexity by the to them astounding announcement that their Master was risen from the dead, showing them by way of proof the empty place where the body had lain, and bids them **tell the disciples and particularly Peter** that he had gone **before them into Galilee**, where they **shall see him**, as he had **said** (cf. 14 : 28). The singling out of Peter was either in recognition of his leadership among the Eleven or in assurance of the Master’s forgiveness of his denials of him. Possibly, both ideas entered into it. The reminder of his words spoken on the night of his betrayal was needed in view of the confused excitement into which they would be thrown by the astounding announcement of his Resurrection. All account of this Galilean meeting, however, is lacking in this Gospel; though it may have been given in the original ending of the narrative which is lost.

8. there shall ye see him, as he said unto you. And they went out, and fled from the tomb; for trembling and astonishment had come upon them: and they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid.

LATER ENDING OF THE GOSPEL

The following twelve verses are not a part of the original text—having been substituted for the lost ending of the narrative by a later hand. There is also a shorter ending, equally second-hand. They are obviously an effort to supplement from the other Gospels the uncompleted record of the post-resurrection events by giving an account of the appearances to the women and the disciples, closing with a summary statement of the Ascension and the after activities of the Apostolic band (see Introduction, VII).

9. Now when he was risen early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, from
 10. whom he had cast out seven demons. She went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned
 11. and wept. And they, when they heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, disbelieved.

Matthew's account of the angel's words (28 : 5-7) agrees substantially with Mark's; Luke's is much expanded, including a reminder of the prediction made specifically to the Twelve (24 : 5-7).

8. However the angel's message had relieved the perplexity of the women at not finding the Master's body, its amazing statement that the Master had returned to life, added to their sight of this angelic appearance, produced in them feelings which were as fearsome as later, when they had recovered from the shock, they were full of astonished joy and they literally **fled from the tomb**, confused in thought and paralyzed in speech. Luke makes no reference to these feelings, though Matthew substantially reproduces it, adding, however, the following element of joy which entered their hearts (28 : 8).

9-11. **Appeared first to Mary Magdalene:** This is strikingly out of continuity with the preceding narrative, from which we would expect an account of how the women brought the message to the disciples. Instead, we have, with all the marks of a fragmentary interpolation, an account of what happened after the news was brought to the disciples and two of them had gone to the tomb to verify it. It is

12. And after these things he was manifested in another form unto two of them, as they walked, on their way
 13. into the country. And they went away and told it unto the rest: neither believed they them.
 14. And afterward he was manifested unto the eleven themselves as they sat at meat; and he upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them that had seen him after

evidently gathered from Jn. 20 : 11-18 and Lk. 24 : 8-11. **From whom he had cast out seven demons**—mentioned by Luke in his summary statement of the second preaching tour (8 : 1-3).

12-13. **In another form:** The reference here is doubtless to the fact that to Mary he seemed to be the gardener (Jn. 20 : 15), while to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, from whose experience (Lk. 24 : 35) the statement of this second appearance is taken, he seemed to be a stranger pilgrim at the Feast (Lk. 24 : 16-18). It was the impression created rather than the form itself which was different. **Two of them**—referring back to the phrase of ver. 10—"them that were with him"—which is intended to indicate the general discipleship rather than the Eleven. **Neither believed they them:** This added statement is apparently inferred by the writer from such statements as are made in Matt. 28 : 16f., Jn. 20 : 24-29. As a matter of fact, they are not consistent with the Lukan record (24 : 33-35).

14-18. **Afterward:** The writer gives no definite statement of time, though, from the Lukan record, this appearance occurred the same evening as the preceding appearance (24 : 35f.). **As they sat at meat**—evidently, an inference by the writer from the statement of Lk. 24 : 41-43. **Upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart:** There is nothing in any of the Gospels' record of the Master's appearances to the Eleven, not even including the incident of Thomas (Matt. 28 : 16-20; Lk. 24 : 13-43; Jn. 20 : 1-21 : 24), which justifies this severity of rebuke or the reason for it which follows. It may have taken its color from Lk. 24 : 25, or more probably from the tendency in the later Apostolic age to look with amazement upon all evidences of unreceptivity towards the revelation of God in Christ (see note on 4 : 12). It is not probable that with such a rebuke on his lips the Master would proceed to commission the disciples to go **into all the world and preach the Gospel** to the whole creation. This commission is here connected in time with this appearance, but in actual fact it was given in Galilee more than a week after this appearance to the disciples in Jerusalem (cf. Jn. 20 : 26; 21 : 1 with Matt. 28 : 16-20).

15. he was risen. And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole
 16. creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned.
 17. And these signs shall accompany them that believe: in my name shall they cast out demons; they shall
 18. speak with ¹ new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall in no wise hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.
 19. So then the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken unto them, was received up into heaven, and sat down at

¹ Some MSS. omit *new*.

The writer is misled to this connection doubtless by the words of the Master to the disciples at the Jerusalem gathering, as recorded in the Fourth Gospel (20 : 21-23), which however do not represent the same charge. The range of the Commission is substantially the same as that given in Matt. 28 : 19; since the Matthew phrase, "all the nations," cannot be restricted to the Gentile peoples, exclusive of the Jews. But the content of the commission is significantly different. With our writer, baptism, along with faith, is given as a condition of salvation. In Matthew (28 : 19f.) baptism is an expression of their discipleship; while the **signs** which were to **accompany them that believe**, as evidence of their authoritative mission, not as testimony to the reality of their faith, are wholly foreign to the Matthew record. They are introduced from the experience of the Apostolic age; though the casting out of **demons** and the healing of the **sick** have also behind them the Master's commission to the Twelve on their final Galilean preaching tour (Matt. 10 : 8; cf. also Mk. 6 : 7, 13; Lk. 10 : 9, 17). Also the immunity from **serpents** seems to have belonged to assurances given to the disciples at some later time in his ministry (cf. Lk. 10 : 19. See notes on 6 : 7-13).

19, 20. **After he had spoken to them:** In giving the impression that the Ascension occurred on the evening after the Resurrection, the writer may be following the narrative in Luke, where there is no statement of the interval of time between the first appearance to the Eleven in Jerusalem and the final meeting with them "over against Bethany" (24 : 49f.), which is specifically indicated in the opening

20. the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them,

verses of Acts (1 : 1-5). On the other hand, when we consider the general statements of sequence in vs. 12 and 14, he may not have intended anything more here than that it occurred after Jesus' interviews with the disciples, a summary or sample of which had been given in vs. 15-18. **Sat down at the right hand of God:** While this expression has behind it the citation from the 110th Psalm made by Jesus in his teaching on Tuesday of Holy Week (12 : 36), as also his statement in answer to the High Priest's question at the Sanhedrin trial (14 : 61f.), it is rather an expression of the faith of the Apostolic age than a narration of the event of the Ascension (cf. Lk. 24 : 51 [See the bracketing of the phrase "and was carried up into heaven" in the Greek text]; Acts 1 : 9f.). The closing verse is a brief summary of the activities of the Apostolic Age, colored by its experiences of the divine confirmation of its message (cf. Heb. 2 : 3f.; Rom. 15 : 18f.; Acts 8 : 4-7; 19 : 10f.).

It is quite impossible to construct a harmonistic narrative of the post-Resurrection events which will include all the items of the independent accounts as given us in the four Gospels. It can be said, however, that it is not likely that there was a visit by Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to view the sepulchre (Matt. 28 : 1) before the visit of the women who brought the spices for the anointing; or that, when the women with the spices came, Mary Magdalene went ahead of them and, seeing the empty tomb, returned at once to tell Peter and John (Jn. 20 : 1); or that, following the first group of women who had a vision of a single angel, there came another group who had a vision of two angels (Lk. 24 : 4, 10). It is most probable that these differing statements are simply natural variants of independent, fragmentary accounts of a single visit by the women, early in the morning, for the purpose of completing the hasty burial preparation of the body on Friday afternoon. They may have become divided into groups as they proceeded on their way, so that the two Marys reached the tomb first (Matt. 28 : 1), while, when they returned to the city, Mary Magdalene may have hastened from the tomb, not only before the others, but before they had received the angel message of the Resurrection; so that the word she brought to Peter and John was simply the distressing fact that the sepulchre was empty (Jn. 20 : 2); but the narratives give us, generally speaking, the record of one visit of the women to the tomb, with one purpose in view. To them, returning to the city, the Master may have appeared, as stated in Matt. 28 : 9f.

On those two disciples' becoming acquainted with the startling facts, it is perfectly natural that they should have proceeded at once

and confirming the word by the signs that followed.
Amen.

to the sepulchre to verify them, and there is no reason to doubt that, reaching the place and finding it empty as they had been told, it was John alone who rose to even a dawning faith as to what might be behind the facts (Jn. 20 : 3-10; cf. Lk. 24 : 12). Mary Magdalene quite likely may have returned to the sepulchre, if not in company with, at least at the same time as Peter and John, and to her, either remaining or arriving after they left, the Master may have appeared, as stated in Jn. 20 : 14-18 (cf. Mk. 16 : 9). It is possible that she may have had another vision of angels, as recorded in Jn. 20 : 11-13; although it is more likely that the angelic messengers, having accomplished their mission of acquainting the followers of Jesus with the fact of the Resurrection, departed, and that this account in the Fourth Gospel is a confusion of that given in the Synoptics (Mk. 16 : 5-7; Matt. 28 : 2-7; Lk. 24 : 4-7). The appearances to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus (Lk. 24 : 13ff.; cf. Mk. 16 : 12), to Peter (Lk. 24 : 34; cf. 1 Cor. 15 : 5), and to the Eleven (Lk. 24 : 36ff.; Jn. 20 : 19ff.; cf. Mk. 16 : 14) follow naturally in the region of Jerusalem; while the appearances in Galilee (Jn. 21 : 1-23; Matt. 28 : 16f. cf. 1 Cor. 15 : 6f.) would naturally seem to be later. The appearance to the 500 mentioned by Paul (1 Cor. 15 : 6) was probably identical with that recorded by Matthew (28 : 16f.) and followed directly upon the meeting at the Lake, narrated by John (21 : 1-23); the appearance to James (1 Cor. 15 : 7) may fittingly have been the last before the Ascension—that to “all the apostles,” which is added by Paul, being possibly the final appearance at the time of the Ascension. Whether the commission was given in connection with the appearance to the Eleven in Jerusalem, as seems to be implied by Luke (24 : 46-48)—or later, when he appeared to the disciples in Galilee, as indicated by Matthew (28 : 18-20)—or at the last, before he was received up into heaven, which is also possible of inference from the Lukan account (24 : 46-51 cf. Mk. 16 : 15-19), may be difficult to determine. It would seem most natural that it would be reserved for the last, Luke, in his desire to take up the narrative of his Second Book, compressing unnaturally the closing narrative of his Gospel story (cf. Plummer, *Commentary on Luke*, p. 561; and for a general discussion of the difficulties of the narratives of the Post-Resurrection period, Plummer's *Commentary on Matthew*, 28 : 1-20; Latham, *The Risen Master*; Swete, *The Appearances of Our Lord after the Passion*).

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND SUBJECTS

A

Abiathar, 9.
 Abimelech, 9.
 Adversary, 42.
 Ahaz, 144.
 Alabastron, 201.
 Alexander, 11.
 Alphæus, 238.
 Altar of Zeus, 193.
 Andrews, 241.
 Antiochus Epiphanes, 193.
 Antipas, 96.
 Antonia, 224, 226, 229.
 Apocalyptic ideas, 9, 14.
 Archelaus, 224.
 Aristion, 28.
 Aristobulus, 96, 97.
 Armenian MS., 28.

B

Bacon, 10, 15.
 Baptist, 44.
 Bar-Abba, 226.
 Bar-Jonah, 44.
 Barnabas, 6, 9, 27, 68.
 Beelzebul, 69.
 Bethsaida, 44, 100, 118.
 Boanerges, 10, 24.
 Burkitt, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 18, 25, 241.
 Burton, 7, 21, 22.
 Buxtorf, 149.

C

Cæsarea, 124.
 Caiaphas, 200.
 Caligula, 193.
 Canaanites, 113.
 Capernaum, 44, 50, 52, 57, 58, 69, 72,
 86, 100, 145, 209.

Carmel, 40.
 Celibacy, 148.
 Cephas, 44.
 Ceremonialism, 107.
 Chalcis, 97.
 Cleopas, 238.
 Clopas, 238.
 Colson, 7.
 Conybeare, 28.
 Cyprus, 230.
 Cyrene, 230.

D

Dalman, 161, 162.
 Dalmanutha, 10.
 David, 184.
 Day of the Lord, 195.
 Decalogue, 151, 152.
 Deissmann, 230.
 Demon, 83.
 Denarius, 101, 186.
 Denney, 25.
 Didymus, 68.
 Dioscuri, 68.
 Domitian, 157.

E

Edersheim, 101, 107, 108, 167, 185,
 199, 205, 216, 232, 238, 240.
 Elephantiasis, 51.
 Elijah, 39.
 Embalming, 203, 241.
 Ephraim, 145.
 Epilepsy, 136.
 Esdrælon, 40.
 Eucharist, 9.
 Eusebius, 7, 22, 23, 27.
 Exorcism, 83.

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND SUBJECTS

F

Freer, 26, 28.

Furrer, 234.

G

Gabbatha, 226.

Gadara, 82.

Galen, 48.

Galilee, 44.

Garvie, 87, 126, 133, 235, 236.

Genessaret, 45.

Gersa, 82.

Gethsemane, 89.

Gould, 156.

Gulgoltha, 231.

Guthe, 103.

H

Hallel, 211.

Harris, 68.

Hatch, 37.

Hawkins, 21.

Hebrew, 232, 235.

Hellenism, 65.

Hermas, 27.

Hermion, 130.

Herod, 11, 45, 58, 65, 93, 95, 96, 160, 187.

Herodians, 175, 177.

Hillel, 146.

Hinnom, 143, 144.

Hogg, 79, 87, 138, 159, 177, 198, 208, 235.

Homer, 114.

Hyrceanus, 96.

I

Irenæus, 27.

Ituræa, 96.

J

Jacob, 44.

James, 44, 238.

Jerome, 27.

Jerusalem, 193.

Jewish War, 9.

Joanna, 44, 241.

Johannan, 44.

John, 44, 171.

Jonah, 44.

Jonas, 44.

Josephus, 45, 97, 124, 187, 224, 231, 238.

Josiah, 144.

Judæa, 44.

Justin Martyr, 27.

K

Kapharnaum, 45.

Kepha, 67.

Kerioth, 68.

Kersa, 82.

Khân Minyeh, 45.

L

Last Supper, 9.

Latham, 247.

Lazarus, 116, 201.

Legate of Syria, 224.

Leprosy, 51.

Lightfoot, 208.

Locusts, 39.

Logia, 22.

M

Machærus, 96, 98.

Magadan, 118.

Magdala, 82, 118, 237.

Malchus, 216.

Mariamme, 96.

Mary, 238.

Menzies, 8, 11, 25, 171, 178, 230.

Messiahship, 14, 125.

Messianic Spirit, 42.

Milman, 187, 189.

Mishna, 107.

Moffat, 9, 12, 28, 107.

Moulton, 241.

N

Nardostachys Jatamansi, 201.

en-Nâsira, 40.

Nazareth, 45.

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND SUBJECTS

O

Old Testament Quotations, 3

P

Pan, 124.
 Paneas, 124.
 Papias, 7, 9, 22, 23, 28.
 Paschal Day, 238.
 Passion chronology, 206.
 Passover, 9, 61, 102, 200, 204, 206.
 Patmos, 157.
 Pavement, 226.
 Pentateuch, 179.
 Pentecost, 61.
 Perean chapters, 19.
 Peter, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 44.
 Pharaoh, 76.
 Pharisees, 65, 147, 175, 177
 Phasaëlis, 160.
 Philip, 96.
 Philo, 224.
 Phœnicians, 113.
 Phylacteries, 180.
 Pilate, 224, 238.
 Plato, 7.
 Plummer, 164, 247.
 Possession, 84.
 Prætorium, 224.
 Procurator, 224.
 Prophets, 179.
 Ptolemy, 201, 230.
 Purification rites, 39.

R

Ramah, 239.
 Ramathaim-Zophim, 239.
 Rome, 3, 10.
 Rufus, 3, 11.

S

Sadducees, 65, 96, 147, 177.
 Salome, 44, 97.
 Sanday, 14, 103, 230, 231.
 Sanhedrin, 170, 175, 200.

Satan, 42.
 Schürer, 46, 50, 86, 99, 107, 178, 180,
 190, 219, 224, 226.
 Scribes, 185, 186.
 Sermon on the Mount, 180, 181.
 Shammai, 146.
 Shema', 180.
 Siloam, 205.
 Simeon, 43.
 Simon, 44.
 Simon of Cyrene, 3.
 Simon, High Priest, 96.
 Simon Maccabæus, 44.
 Sinaiticus, 27.
 Sinaitic Syriac, 27.
 Smith, 41, 206.
 Stanley, 172.
 Stanton, 11, 23.
 Streeter, 13, 22.
 Swete, 8, 11, 149, 150, 167, 186, 203,
 224, 230, 247.
 Synagogue, 50, 51, 107.

T

Tacitus, 187, 190.
 Taxation, 57, 58.
 Tell Hûm, 45.
 Temple, 187.
 Theophilus, 6.
 Tiberias, 95.
 Trachonitis, 97.
 Tristram, 39, 42, 54, 201.

V

Vaticanus, 27.

W

Wendling, 13.
 Westcott, 224.

Z

Zahn, 2, 5, 11, 28, 218.
 Zebedee, 238.

INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN TEXT

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis 1:2.....	41	Numbers 3:49.....	159
2:24.....	147	11:25.....	132
19:17.....	67	12:14.....	221
19:21.....	176	14:6.....	221
25:26.....	44	15:37-41.....	180
29:33.....	44	15:38-40.....	106
32:10.....	94	19:2.....	162
37:29, 34.....	221	19:9.....	107
40:11.....	157	35:30.....	220
Exodus 3.....	179	Deuteronomy 4:24.....	68
11:5.....	143	6:4-9.....	180
12:1-28.....	200	10:17.....	176
16:10.....	132	11:13-21.....	180
19:9, 16.....	132	15:9.....	111
20:5.....	68	17:6.....	220
20:8-11.....	6	18:15, 18.....	132
20:12.....	108	19:15.....	220
21:17.....	108	21:3.....	162
21:30.....	159	21:23.....	238
22:22.....	185	23:25.....	61
24:8.....	210	24:1.....	147
24:15.....	132	25:5-10.....	178
33:9.....	132	25:9.....	221
34:21.....	61	27:16.....	108
35:2.....	61	Joshua 9:4.....	61
40:35.....	132	10:36-39.....	50
Leviticus 2:13.....	144	15:20-61.....	50
11.....	110	15:25.....	68
11:22.....	39	Judges 1:19.....	67
15:12.....	107	12:6.....	223
15:19-27.....	87	14:10.....	59
16:2.....	132	Ruth 2:14.....	234
18:16.....	96	I Samuel 2:14.....	107
19:15.....	176	15:22.....	182
19:18.....	181	16:7.....	176
25:24.....	159	21:1.....	9

PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN TEXT

	PAGE		PAGE
I Samuel 22:20.....	62	Isaiah 14:11.....	144
42:18.....	176	14:30.....	189
II Samuel 8:17.....	62	29:13.....	108
17:13.....	187	42:1.....	41, 132
I Kings 2:19.....	157	44:3.....	40
13:4-6.....	63	45:13.....	159
17:8-24.....	235	48:16.....	41
19:2, 10.....	135	50:6.....	221
II Kings 1:8.....	39	53.....	208, 217
4:34.....	51	56:7.....	167
4:42.....	94	60:5, 11.....	152
5:11.....	51	61:1.....	41, 91
5:14.....	107	62:4.....	41
7:18.....	101	66:24.....	144
9:13.....	163	Jeremiah 7:31.....	144
14:25.....	44	23:9.....	53
23:10.....	144	23:19.....	189
I Chronicles 3:24.....	44	24:2.....	166
18:16.....	10, 62	31:31-33.....	210
II Chronicles 23:3.....	144	48:24, 41.....	68
35:13.....	107	Lamentations 4:1.....	187
Esther 5:3, 6.....	98	Ezekiel 5:12.....	189
7:2.....	98	16:1-22.....	129
Job 4:15.....	104	20:30.....	144
Psalms 2:7.....	41	36:25.....	40
22.....	234, 235	Daniel 3:18.....	177
22:18.....	233	3:25.....	237
23:5.....	202	6:10.....	177
41:9.....	208	7:10.....	196
51.....	182	7:13.....	55, 221
69:21.....	231	9:27.....	188
82:2.....	176	11:31.....	188, 193
89:32.....	66	12:1.....	194
91:11.....	42	12:2.....	154
110.....	221	12:11.....	193
110:1.....	157, 183	Hosea 2:2-13.....	129
115-118.....	211	6:6-8.....	182
118:25.....	163	Joel 2:30.....	119
Proverbs 18:5.....	176	2:31.....	235
Song of Solomon 2:13.....	166	2:32.....	195
Isaiah 5:1.....	172	Amos 8:9.....	235
5:24.....	144	Micah 1:6.....	187
8:21.....	189	Nahum 3:3.....	131
11:12.....	41	Zechariah 9:9.....	162
13:13.....	189	11:12.....	204

PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN TEXT

	PAGE		PAGE
Zechariah 13:4.....	39	Matthew 11:14.....	96, 135
13:7.....	212	11:28.....	51
Malachi 4:5.....	96, 134	12:5-7.....	62
I Maccabees 1:54.....	193	12:22.....	69
4:46.....	39	12:23.....	69, 90, 95
6:39.....	131	12:28, 45.....	62
14:41.....	39	12:34.....	70
I Esdras 1:17.....	200	12:40.....	127
8:57.....	131	12:43.....	46
IV Esdras 2:29.....	144	13:1.....	72
16:36-40.....	189	13:13.....	75
Enoch 1:1.....	195	13:26.....	78
1:6.....	189	13:41.....	196
27:1.....	144	13:43.....	196
Matthew 3:7.....	59	14:5.....	97
3:14-17.....	39	15:1-20.....	180
3:15.....	52	15:11.....	62
4:8.....	129	15:20.....	111
5:21-48.....	180	15:30.....	114
5:26.....	186	16:14.....	96
5:43-48.....	181	17:20.....	79
5:31.....	146	17:24.....	48
6:21.....	62	17:27.....	143, 162
6:23.....	152	18:17.....	58
7:2.....	78	19:3.....	146
7:12.....	181	19:10-12.....	148
7:21.....	72	19:28.....	67, 157
8:6.....	53	20:15.....	111
8:11.....	114	22:18.....	111
8:18.....	80	23:5.....	180, 185
8:21.....	72	23:5-7.....	111
8:24.....	80	23:6.....	64, 185
8:28.....	83	23:24.....	152
8:29.....	47	23:33.....	180
9:11, 14.....	52	24:3, 14, 29.....	6
9:23, 24.....	89	24:41.....	143
9:30.....	52	24:45-51.....	199
10:1.....	93	25.....	199
10:5.....	93, 114	25:29.....	78
10:7.....	93	25:31.....	196
10:23.....	191	26:39, 42.....	72
10:25.....	70	26:55.....	185
10:34-39.....	72	27:15.....	226
11:2-30.....	69	27:52.....	89
11:9.....	39	27:56.....	44

PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN TEXT

	PAGE		PAGE
Matthew 28:16.....	27	Luke 12:1.....	146
Luke 2:27.....	183	12:8.....	56
3:7.....	38	12:16-20.....	129
3:10.....	38	12:20.....	111
3:12.....	38, 58	12:42-46.....	199
3:15.....	95	13:2.....	54
4:16.....	52	13:14.....	64
4:16-21.....	51	13:24.....	152
4:16-30.....	114	13:27.....	157
4:18.....	91	13:31-33.....	103
4:21.....	91	13:34.....	116
4:25-27.....	93	14:3-5.....	64
4:28-30.....	92	14:7.....	64
4:33.....	46	14:7-11.....	185
4:39.....	81	14:25.....	72, 146
5:1-3.....	57	15:1.....	146
5:3.....	66, 81	15:12.....	186
5:17.....	53	15:22.....	185
5:29.....	57	15:30.....	185, 186
6:2.....	52	16:29.....	179
6:38.....	78	17:6.....	79
6:42.....	70	17:14.....	52
7:11-17.....	69, 81	17:23-34.....	195
7:14.....	52, 90	18:12.....	59
7:18-35.....	69	18:23.....	98
7:23.....	212	18:43.....	161
7:36-50.....	69	19:1-6.....	57
7:37.....	58, 237	19:1-10.....	58
7:39.....	52	19:10.....	56
7:46.....	202	19:11.....	157, 160
8:2.....	185	19:26.....	78
8:43.....	186	19:41.....	116
8:55.....	90	21:5.....	187
9:1.....	93	21:20, 24.....	6
9:2.....	93	21:36.....	56
9:7.....	95	22:3.....	208
9:8.....	96	22:20.....	210
9:10, 11, 12.....	100	22:24.....	93
9:51-56.....	146	22:24-26.....	141
9:54.....	68	22:29.....	157
10:4.....	94	22:30.....	67
10:26-28.....	52	22:35.....	94
10:29-37.....	181	22:39.....	211
10:39-42.....	203	23:28.....	194
11:1.....	59	24:10-12.....	127

PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN TEXT

	PAGE		PAGE
Luke 24:30.....	103	John 9:6.....	115
24:44.....	179	9:16.....	70
John 1-3.....	43	10:41.....	96
1:14.....	133	11:11-14.....	89
1:21.....	96, 132	11:16.....	213
1:30-34.....	39	11:41.....	116
1:42.....	57	11:43.....	90, 203
1:45.....	132, 179	12:6.....	204
1:48.....	162	12:20-22.....	186
1:51.....	196	12:20-50.....	184
2:6.....	107	12:24.....	79
2:13-16.....	166	12:34.....	56
2:18.....	167	12:36.....	187
2:19.....	127, 167	13:2.....	208
2:20.....	166	13:26.....	204
3:10.....	73	15:18-24.....	192
3:14.....	127	16:2.....	192
3:28.....	38	16:13.....	191
4:17.....	108	18:15.....	2
4:34.....	72	18:20.....	46
4:44.....	92	18:39.....	226
5:1.....	117	19:23.....	94
5:3.....	63	19:39.....	203
5:7.....	54	20:1-9.....	127
5:14.....	54	20:1-10.....	2
5:16-18.....	127	21:9, 13.....	101
5:30.....	72	Acts 1:6.....	121, 127, 152, 157, 183
5:44.....	2	2:23.....	8, 75
6:9.....	101	2:28.....	210
6:14.....	90	2:38.....	8, 38
6:23.....	95	2:43.....	137
6:24.....	105	3:2.....	63
6:38.....	72	3:22.....	132
6:42.....	92	4:8.....	191
6:51-56.....	127	4:17.....	192
6:51.....	209	4:19.....	177
6:52-58.....	209	4:28.....	8, 75
6:59.....	105	5:15.....	66
6:60-63.....	119	5:29.....	177
6:67.....	125	5:41.....	192
6:68.....	117	6:14.....	220
7:7.....	192	7:42.....	179
7:19-24.....	127	7:55.....	157
8:20.....	185	7:60.....	39
9:2.....	54	8:22.....	76

PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN TEXT

	PAGE		PAGE
Acts 9:2.....	176	Romans 11:7, 25.....	8, 75
9:14.....	192	13:9.....	181
9:25.....	118	13:13.....	111
9:37.....	203	14.....	3, 8, 111
9:39.....	94	14:13-15.....	143
10:9-16.....	127	14:14.....	106
10:14.....	106	14:20-23.....	143
10:15.....	8, 111	15:19.....	191
10:28.....	152	16:13.....	3
10:40.....	127	I Corinthians 2:4.....	191
10:43.....	8, 38, 210	3:23.....	9
11:26.....	9	6:8.....	8
12:1.....	157	6:12-20.....	111
12:2.....	44	7:10-16.....	148
12:12.....	6	8.....	111
12:13.....	222	8:4, 7, 9-13.....	143
12:25.....	6	9:9.....	47, 81
13:5.....	6	10:23-33.....	8, 111
13:9.....	191	11:24.....	209, 211
13:13.....	6	11:25.....	210
13:15.....	86	12:3.....	183
13:36.....	89	15:1-8.....	26
13:38.....	8, 38, 210	15:4.....	127
13:51.....	94	15:20.....	89
15:39.....	6	15:35-53.....	178
16:1.....	203	15:37.....	79
18:6.....	94	II Corinthians 5:12.....	176
18:25.....	176	6:1.....	71
19:9.....	176	Galatians 1:14.....	107
19:11.....	66	2:6.....	176
19:13-16.....	46, 139	2:11-14.....	127
19:23.....	176	2:15.....	58
22:16.....	210	3:13.....	159
23:8.....	178	4:22.....	222
23:9.....	58	5:14.....	181
23:10.....	83	5:19-21.....	8, 111
24:14, 22.....	176	Ephesians 1:7.....	159
26:9.....	192	3:3-6.....	74
27:35.....	102	4:19.....	8, 111
28:23.....	179	4:31.....	8, 111
Romans 1:29-31.....	8, 111	5:3.....	8, 111
3:23.....	159	6:19.....	74
4:7.....	76	Philippians 3:7.....	129
8:9.....	9, 183	Colossians 4:10.....	6
11:2.....	179	I Thessalonians 1:9.....	12

PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN TEXT

	PAGE		PAGE
II Thessalonians 1:7.....	129	I Peter 5:13.....	6
2:1-3.....	189	II Peter 1:17.....	132, 133
2:9-12.....	195	I John 1:9.....	76
I Timothy 2:6.....	159	2:12.....	76
5:18.....	47	III John 11.....	64
II Timothy 4:11.....	6	Jude 16.....	176
Titus 2:14.....	159	Revelations 1:7.....	196
Philemon 24.....	6	1:9.....	157
Hebrews 1:13.....	196	1:10.....	183
1:14.....	129	2:17.....	57
6:18-20.....	236	6:8.....	189
9:12-14.....	159	6:11.....	185
10:19.....	236	6:13.....	166
James 1:2-4.....	144	6:15.....	97
2:8.....	181	11:13.....	189
2:19.....	47	13:18.....	198
5:4.....	111	14:14.....	196
5:14.....	95	16:18.....	194
5:15.....	76	17:14.....	195
I Peter 1:18.....	159	18:8.....	189
2:8.....	8, 75	21:12, 14.....	67
3:17.....	64	21:27.....	106

Printed in the United States of America

THE following pages contain advertisements of a few of the Macmillan books on kindred subjects

The Bible for Home and School

Edited by SHAILER MATHEWS, D.D., Dean of the Divinity School, and Professor of Historical and Comparative Theology in the University of Chicago, Editor of the Series of "New Testament Handbooks," etc.

"Biblical science has progressed rapidly during the past few years, but the reader still lacks a brief but comprehensive commentary that shall extend to him in usable form material now at the disposition of the student. It is hoped that in this series the needs of intelligent Sunday-school teachers have been met, as well as those of clergymen and lay readers, and that in scope, purpose, and loyalty to the Scriptures as a foundation of Christian thought and life, its volumes will stimulate the intelligent use of the Bible in the home and the school." — *From the General Introduction to the Series.*

Each volume is convenient in size, well printed on excellent paper, and attractively and serviceably bound.

VOLUMES NOW READY

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

By EDGAR J. GOODSPEED, Assistant Professor of Biblical and Patristic Greek in the University of Chicago.

Cloth, ix+132 pages. Price, 50 cents

"It is scholarly and modern, yet simple, a truly interpretive commentary, not uncritical, though criticism is not obtruded, not without the results of keen philological study, though the reader sees little or nothing of the processes. The Epistle becomes an illuminating exponent of the spiritual life of its time." — BENJAMIN W. BACON in the *Yale Divinity Quarterly*.

ACTS Being the second volume of Luke's work on the Beginnings of Christianity, with interpretative comment.

By GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT, Ph.D., D.D.

Cloth, 267 pages. Price, 75 cents

"Dr. Mathews and his fellow-editors are performing a task for the Church of to-day that should be far-reaching in its results; for there is pressing need that the rank and file of Bible students be equipped with the material for an historical interpretation. This is a necessary step to the creation of a theology which is in harmony with the present age, wherein all science is studied historically; and, furthermore, the transition from the traditional to the historical view will be furthered through the production of such aids to Bible study as those under review, rather than through theoretical discussions on the relative merits of the respective views." — *Lutheran Quarterly*.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers

64-66 Fifth Avenue

New York

The Bible for Home and School—Volumes now ready—*Cont.*

GENESIS

By HINCKLEY GILBERT MITCHELL, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in Boston University.

Cloth, 377 pages. Price, 90 cents

"The introduction to this volume on Genesis gives the very best and clearest analysis of the book, according to the 'modern critical theories,' to be had anywhere."—*The Presbyterian*.

"Genesis has always been one of the most popular books of the Bible, yet in some ways it is one of the most difficult. These difficulties arise partly from the book itself and partly from the popular conception of the book. It takes scholarship to handle the first class of difficulties, and courage the second; and Dr. Mitchell has both scholarship and courage. . . . The notes are learned and brief and have a vivacity that make Genesis seem quite a modern book."—*Boston Transcript*.

GALATIANS

By BENJAMIN WISNER BACON, D.D., LL.D., Professor of New Testament Criticism and Exegesis in Yale University.

Cloth, 135 pages. Price, 50 cents

"Learned, vigorous, and stimulating."—*American Journal of Theology*.

"We know of no commentary which gives a better exposition in so brief a compass."—*The Reform Church Review*.

COLOSSIANS AND EPHESIANS

By GROSS ALEXANDER, Editor of *The Methodist Review*.

Cloth, 132 pages. Price, 50 cents

"Judging from the volumes that have appeared, the general editor of these commentaries has been very successful in getting commentators who have the skill so to treat the books of the Bible that they come to the men of to-day with vital power. The introductions to these two epistles are marvels of compactness; yet all that is necessary to those for whom this series is intended for an understanding of these letters will be found here."—*Boston Transcript*.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers

64-66 Fifth Avenue

New York

The Bible for Home and School—Volumes now ready—*Cont.*

AMOS, HOSEA, AND MICAH

By JOHN M. POWIS SMITH.

12mo, 75 cents

DEUTERONOMY

By PROFESSOR W. G. JORDAN, of Queens University.

Price, 75 cents

ISAIAH

By JOHN E. MCFADYEN, Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis in Knox College, Toronto.

Price, 90 cents

JOB

By GEORGE A. BARTON, A.M., Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Semitic Languages in Bryn Mawr College.

Price, 90 cents

The commentary differs from the large majority of commentaries on Job, in that its author believes that the Hebrew poet was as great in religious insight as in poetic genius, and that he did not leave the problem of suffering unsolved, but proposed for it a solution, the most profound that can be suggested, and that a religious solution.

JUDGES

By E. L. CURTIS.

Cloth. Price, 75 cents

In general style this addition to the "Bible for Home and School" follows the deservedly popular commentaries already published in the series. There is an introduction in which points of special interest are noted, a liberal supply of notes elucidating doubtful passages, an index, and a bibliography. The book well carries out the spirit and aim of the series—to place at the disposal of the general reader the results of the best modern Biblical scholarship. The editing has been conservative, though no established facts have been ignored. The circulation of the compact and convenient volumes of the series of which this is one cannot fail to stimulate the intelligent use of the Bible in the home and in the school.

MARK

By M. W. JACOBUS.

12mo

MATTHEW

By PROFESSOR A. T. ROBERTSON, of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Price, 60 cents

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers

64-66 Fifth Avenue

New York

NEW BOOKS ON RELIGION

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION

By SHAILER MATHEWS, Author of "The Church and the Changing Order," "The Gospel and the Modern Man," etc.

Cloth. 12mo

Dr. Mathews here enters upon the little explored territory of social theology. His general position is that the scientific theologian should approach his task through the social sciences, particularly history, rather than through philosophy. The main thesis of the book is that doctrines grow out of the same social forces as express themselves in other forms of life. Dr. Mathews finds seven creative social minds and treats the development of the various Christian doctrines as they have emerged from the earlier of these minds and must be created by our modern social mind. Such a treatment of Christian doctrine serves to make theology a vital rather than a merely scholastic or ecclesiastical matter. The study of the social minds of the past, with their creative influence on Christianity, gives a point of view for the study of the intellectual needs of to-day's religion. This volume conserves the values of the religious thinking of the past, and is, in addition, a positive force in the reconstruction of the religious thinking of the day.

THE DRAMA OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE: A Study of Religious Experience and Ideals

By ANNIE L. SEARS. With an Introduction by DR. JOSIAH ROYCE.

Cloth. 8vo

The basis of this book is an empirical study of the prayers, hymns, and general religious poetry and other expressions of religious experience. In the opening chapter it is stated that "man is incurably religious" because, as human, man is idealistic. Religion is, therefore, close to the common life, yet in religious idealism a problem is involved. This problem religious mysticism attempts to solve. In the second chapter the author seeks to make clear what are the universal elements of religious experience, and in the succeeding portions of the volume she traces the story of religious experience through its differences, oppositions, tensions, conflicts, compromises and reconciliations. The problem of the work is to discover whether the conflicting elements and forms of religion can be harmonized and whether a significant spiritual experience results.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers

64-66 Fifth Avenue

New York

75x
2141

CINCINNATI BIBLE COLLEGE & SEM. LIBRARY



3 4320 00126 5570

226.307 J15c

Bible.

A commentary on the Gospel
according to Mark

